

UNIVERSITY OF ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE



3 1761 01896759 6







THE BOOKS OF KINGS

THE INTERNATIONAL CRITICAL COMMENTARY

A CRITICAL AND
EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY
ON
THE BOOKS OF KINGS

BY

JAMES A. MONTGOMERY

PH.D., S.T.D., D.H.L., LITT.D.

PROFESSOR EMERITUS IN THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA
AND IN THE PHILADELPHIA DIVINITY SCHOOL

EDITED BY

HENRY SNYDER GEHMAN

PH.D., S.T.D., LITT.D.

PROFESSOR OF OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE AND CHAIR-
MAN OF THE DEPARTMENT OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE,
PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, AND LECTURER IN
SEMITIC LANGUAGES, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

EDINBURGH: T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
MORRISON AND GIBB LIMITED

FOR

T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH II
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK

FIRST IMPRESSION . . . 1951
LATEST IMPRESSION . . . 1960

The Rights of Translation and of Reproduction are Reserved.

IN HONOUR OF
PROVOST WILLIAM PEPPER
PROVOST CHARLES C. HARRISON
PROVOST EDGAR F. SMITH
PROVOST JOSIAH H. PENNIMAN
PRESIDENT THOMAS S. GATES
TO WHOSE WISE, DEVOTED AND SUCCESSFUL
ADMINISTRATIONS OF OUR ALMA MATER
THE AUTHOR AS STUDENT, ALUMNUS, PROFESSOR
BEARS INTIMATE AND GRATEFUL WITNESS

PREFACE

With Alice *Through the Looking-Glass*,

“The time has come,” the Walrus said,
“To talk of many things ;
Of shoes—and ships—and sealing-wax—
Of cabbages—and kings.”

Our book is of like category on the human side, from ‘ships’ and ‘seals’ and ‘the hyssop that grows on the wall’ to ‘kings’ and queens, as well as ordinary folk. But the collection is inspired and dominated by the belief in a unity, which gives the clue to the seemingly crazy checkerboard pattern of human history. It is at once a book ‘of the ways of God’ and ‘of men.’ Hence the extent and variety of subject-matter involved in the following composition, which has gone beyond the bounds of the normal Commentary of the day. In English the last extensive Commentary on Kings is that of G. Rawlinson in 1873, largely inspired by the fresh archaeological discoveries in Egypt and Mesopotamia ; in German, the too little known but admirable work of the Catholic scholar, A. Šanda, of over a thousand pages, now almost thirty years old. Current interest has lain naturally in the more religiously inspiring books of the Hebrew Bible, the Prophets and the Poets, or critically in the still vexed Penta-teuchal problems, or those of many of the Prophetical books. Many notable current histories indeed have included the materials of our book, as a source of history, yet only with indirect display of its character. But the equally divine and human aspect of this book, the compilation of which was inspired by the belief in the God of a people who is also God of human history, deserves attention as part of the *catena* of the earliest surviving attempt at history in the large sense of the word, and that coming from a politically insignificant people, but unique among the ancients in its sense of a universal Providence, tending mistily to “One far-off divine event, To which the whole creation moves.”

In reviewing his work, the writer recognizes its limitations,

which are also his own. He has been primarily a commentator, which duty involves the related linguistics, text-criticism, history of interpretation from the ancient versions down to the present, and the attempt at exact translation with critical display. For lack of room he has not been able to expand on the criticism of the Hebrew text and of the Versions, confining himself mostly to comment *ad locos*. The marvellous results of modern archæology have been recorded, however imperfectly, usually without more than reference to the authorities, who then may disagree among themselves, or whose opinions may be shattered by fresh discoveries, for Dame Archæology has been a chastiser of theoretical reconstructions of literary and so of religious history. The writer has been dealing with the materials of history, but for their historical evaluation he must in large part refer to the many excellent historians, whose duty it is to have 'a vision of the whole.' For example, in the section of the Introduction bearing upon Chronology he has not been able to do much more than to present the bases of that vexed theme and to refer to the many authoritative monographs. Again the Biblical book is a religious compilation, but the large field of the history of Israel's religion may only be touched upon *au courant*, as in the story of the Northern Prophets, or the Southern Isaiah and the problem of Deuteronomy. For this field the reader must refer to the many and ample books on a subject that has especially preoccupied modern interest. In the already too extensive Bibliography there has been omitted reference to such general treatments, the eminent titles among which will be cited in place. Indeed the writer professes that he desires to make the most of these ancient records, to let them speak for themselves, constrained as he is to leave to others their proper placing in the enormous field of Oriental research.

The writer would express his thanks to many good friends for their genial help: to Prof. O. Eissfeldt of the University of Halle for the generous loan of an annotated copy of his Commentary on Kings; to President J. Morgenstern, Professors W. F. Albright, A. D. Nock, A. T. Olmstead, P. K. Hitti. And in particular he records his deep obligations to former students of his, *amicis caris clarisque*, for their interest and most helpful criticism, some of them having toilsomly

read extensive sections of the manuscript book and spent hours of consultation with its author; to Professors H. S. Gehman, Z. S. Harris, F. James, S. L. Skoss, E. A. Speiser C. H. Gordon, H. M. Orlinsky.

And to the Publishers he acknowledges warmly their acceptance of a work that has grown beyond normal bounds.

JAMES A. MONTGOMERY.

February 8, 1941.

The War prevented the American and British publishers from immediate publication of the volume. The writer accordingly took the manuscript back from them *ad interim*, and has spent much time in rectifications and additions, which has been all to the good. A Supplemental Bibliography, only partly drawn upon, exhibits the further extension of the literature on the subject in the intervening years.

But word has at last come from the Messrs. Scribner in New York and T. & T. Clark in Edinburgh that the printing of the volume can begin. The author would express not only his personal gratification, but still more his deep respect for their venture in these days of stress and strain.

J. A. M.

October 18, 1944.

As a graduate student in Semitic Languages and Old Testament at the University of Pennsylvania and the Philadelphia Divinity School the editor took all the courses offered by Professor Montgomery, who aroused his interest in the Septuagint and other versions of the Bible and thus prepared him for his career in Old Testament teaching and research. Twice this manuscript had been ready for publication, as the two dates above indicate, but in each case circumstances beyond the author's control postponed publication. In the meanwhile Professor Montgomery passed his eighty-second year, and for reasons of health he felt that he was not able to make another revision and to read the proofs of his forthcoming work. Under these conditions he asked his former pupil to make the final preparations of the manuscript and see it through the press. The editor was glad to assume this

duty in recognition of Professor Montgomery's contributions to Old Testament Science and with the personal satisfaction of having had a part in mediating to the world of scholarship the crowning work of his preceptor's distinguished career. On February 6, 1949, Professor Montgomery passed to his eternal reward, and while he never saw any of the proofs, he had the satisfaction of knowing that the printing of the Commentary had actually commenced.

The editor has brought the Bibliography up to date and incorporated the author's Supplementary Bibliography in the proper alphabetical order. For the sake of convenience of reference he has also inserted, at Professor Montgomery's request, his own Biblical Chronology of the period of the kings of Israel and Judah as found in the *Westminster Dictionary of the Bible* and in the Concordance of the *Westminster Study Edition of the Holy Bible*. He has also prepared the indexes at the end of the volume. The editor has made some changes and revisions in the manuscript, but these were of the type normally expected of a redactor. The author's spelling of proper names was in all cases retained, and the editor kept at a minimum alterations of English style. In fairness to the author the editor's aim was to let the final product remain the work of Professor Montgomery. The editor at this point wishes to express his gratitude to his colleague and former pupil, Dr. John Wm. Wevers, who gave him valuable assistance in the reading of the proof. While claiming no credit for the merits of the Commentary, the editor found pleasure in rendering a service to Biblical scholarship.

HENRY SNYDER GEHMAN.

PRINCETON, N.J.,
June 1, 1950.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE	vii
BIBLIOGRAPHY	xiii
MODERN BIBLE TRANSLATIONS	xxxvii
CHRONOLOGY	xxxix
CARTOGRAPHY	xxxix
INSCRIPTIONS, EPIGRAPHS, ETC., COMMONLY CITED	xli
KEY TO ABBREVIATIONS	xliii
SYMBOLS IN THE CRITICAL APPARATUS	xlvii
INTRODUCTION	I
I. THE BOOK	I
1. PLACE IN THE CANON AS A DISTINCT BOOK ; CON- TENTS	I
2. TEXT AND LANGUAGE	3
II. ANCIENT VERSIONS	8
3. THE APPARATUS AT LARGE	8
4. THE GREEK VERSIONS	9
<i>a.</i> THE APPARATUS	9
<i>b.</i> THE ALEXANDRIAN (SEPTUAGINTAL) GROUP	10
<i>c.</i> THE LATER JEWISH TRANSLATORS : THEODOTI- AQUILA, SYMMACHUS, ETC.	11
<i>d.</i> ORIGEN'S REVISION AND ITS SUCCESSORS	11
<i>e.</i> THE LUCIANIC REVISION	12
5. THE TARGUM	13
6. THE SYRIAC VERSIONS	13
<i>a.</i> THE PESHITTA	13
<i>b.</i> THE SYRO-HEXAPLA	14
7. THE ETHIOPIC	14
8. THE ARABIC	15
9. OTHER ORIENTAL VERSIONS	15
<i>a.</i> THE SYRO-PALESTINIAN	15
<i>b.</i> THE COPTIC	15
<i>c.</i> THE ARMENIAN	16

	PAGE
10. THE LATIN VERSIONS	16
<i>a.</i> THE OLD LATIN	16
<i>b.</i> THE VULGATE	16
III. GROUPING OF THE VERSIONS	16
11. <i>a.</i> THE ALEXANDRIAN FAMILY	16
<i>b.</i> THE PALESTINIAN (ORIGENIAN) FAMILY	17
<i>c.</i> THE LUCIANIC REVISION AND ITS BACKGROUND; THE PROBLEM OF A PRE-LUCIANIC OR PRE- THEODOTONIC VERSION; CITATIONS IN JOSE- PHUS AND THE NEW TESTAMENT	18
<i>d.</i> THE OTHER ORIENTAL VERSIONS	21
<i>e.</i> VALUE AND INTEREST OF THE VERSIONS	23
IV. THE SOURCES OF THE BOOK.	24
12. COMPARISON WITH CONTEMPORARY HISTORICAL WRITING	24
13. THE CHRONICLES	30
<i>a.</i> THE ROYAL SECRETARIAT. ARCHIVES OF ROYAL PERSONALIA	30
<i>b.</i> FURTHER ARCHIVAL MATERIALS	33
<i>c.</i> TEMPLE ARCHIVES	37
14. THE HISTORICAL STORY	38
<i>a.</i> POLITICAL NARRATIVES	38
<i>b.</i> THE STORIES OF THE PROPHETS	39
15. THE COMPILATION	42
16. THE CHRONOLOGY	45
RECENT LITERATURE	45
<i>a.</i> LIST OF REGNAL TERMS AND SYNCHRONISMS	48
<i>b.</i> THE SYNCHRONISMS BETWEEN THE CHRONICLES OF JUDAH AND ISRAEL	53
<i>c.</i> THE CALCULATION OF REGNAL TERMS	54
<i>d.</i> THE SYNCHRONISMS WITH EXTERNAL HISTORY	55
COMMENTARY	67
INDEXES	57I
I. SELECT VOCABULARY OF HEBREW WORDS AND PHRASES	57I
II. INDEX OF PLACES TREATED WITH ARCHÆOLOGICAL COMMENT	574

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The following lists include titles of general interest or frequent citation.

- ABEL, F. M. : Géographie de la Palestine, 2 vols., 1933-38 [GP].
- AFREM : s. Ephraem.
- AIMÉ-GIRON (earlier GIRON), N. : Textes araméens d'Égypte, 1931.
- ALBRECHT, K. : Neuhebräische Grammatik auf Grund der Mišna, 1913.
- ALBRIGHT, W. F. : The Archæology of Palestine and the Bible, ed. 1, 1932; ed. 3, 1935 [APB].
- The Vocalization of the Egyptian Syllabic Orthography, 1934.
- Recent Discoveries in Bible Lands, in Young's Analytical Concordance, ed. 20, 1936.
- The Ancient Near East and the Religion of Israel, *JBL* 59 (1940), 85-112.
- From the Stone Age to Christianity, 1940; ed. 2, 1946 [SAC].
- An Indexed Bibliography of the Writings of . . . , ed. H. M. Orlinsky, 1941.
- Archæology and the Religion of Israel, 1942; ed. 2, 1946 [ARI].
- The Rôle of the Canaanites in the History of Civilization, in Studies in the History of Culture (dedicated to W. G. Leland), 1942, pp. 11-50.
- ALT, A. : Israel u. Aegypten, 1909.
- Israels Gaue unter Salomo, *BWAT* 13 (1913).
- Aram, *RVg*.
- Die syrische Staatenwelt vor dem Einbruch der Assyrer, *ZDMG* 88 (1934), 233-58 (*in re* the Sūjin texts).
- Israel, *RGG*.
- Die Staatenbildung der Israeliten in Palästina, 1930.
- Zur Geschichte der Grenze zwischen Judäa u. Samaria, *Pjb.*, 31 (1935), 94-111
- Die älteste Schilderung Palästinas im Lichte neuer Funde, *Pjb.*, 37 (1941), 19-49.
- see Kittel, *BH*.
- Ausgrabungen in Sendschirli, Mitteilungen aus den orient. Sammlungen, Berlin, vol. 1, 1893, vol. 4, 1911; contributors J. Euting, F. von Luschan, E. Sachau.

BADÈ, W. E. : Manual of Excavation in the Near East, 1934.

BAEDEKER, K. : Palestine and Syria, ed. 4, 1906.

BÄHR, K. C. W. F. : Die Bücher der Könige, 1868 (Eng. tr. 1873).

BÄR (BAER), S. : Libri Regum (and Heb. title), 1895.

- BARHEBRAEUS : A. Morgenstern, Die Scholien des Gregorius Abulfaraġ . . . zum Buch der Könige, 1895.
- J. Göttsberger, Barhebraeus u. seine Scholien zur Heiligen Schrift, 1900.
- M. Sprengling and W. C. Graham, Scholia on the O.T., part I, 1931 (see Int. 6, n. 3).
- BARNES, H. E. : A History of Historical Writing, 1937.
- BARNES, W. E. : Kings, in Cambridge Bible, 2 vols., 1908.
- BARON, S. W. : Authenticity of the Numbers in the Historical Books of the O.T., *JBL* 49 (1930), 287-91.
- A Social and Religious History of the Jews, 3 vols., 1937.
- BARROIS, A. G. : La métrologie dans la Bible, *RB* 40, (1931), 185-213 ; 41 (1932), 50-76.
- Manuel d'archéologie biblique, vol. 1, 1939.
- BARTON, G. A. : Kings, in *JE*.
- The Royal Inscriptions of Sumer and Akkad, 1929.
- A History of the Hebrew People, 1930.
- Archæology and the Bible, ed. 7, 1937 [*AB*].
- BAUDISSIN, W. W. : Einleitung in die Bücher des A.T., 1901.
- BAUER, H., and LEANDER, P. : Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache, vol. 1, 1922 [*BL*].
- BAUMGARTNER, W. : Ein Kapitel vom hebräischen Erzählungsstyl (Gunkel-Eucharisterion, 1, 145 ff.), 1923.
- Alttestamentliche Religion (1917-27), *ARw.*, 1928, 52 ff. ; *ib.*, 1928-33, 279 ff.
- Alttestamentliche Einleitung u. Religionsgeschichte, *Th.R.*, N.F., 8 (1936), 179-222 (reviews of literature).
- and GUNKEL, H. : Sagen u. Legenden, *RGG*.
- BAUMSTARK, A. : Geschichte der syrischen Literatur, 1922.
- BAUR, P. V. C., and ROSTOVITZEFF, M. I. : The Excavations at Dura-Europos, 1929-44.
- BEER, G. : Saul, David, Salomo, 1906.
- Zur israel.-jüdischen Briefliteratur, *BWAT* 13 (1913), 20 ff.
- BENTZEN, A. : Die josianische Reform und ihre Voraussetzungen, 1926.
- Indledning til det Gamle Testamente, 1941.
- BEN TZVI, I. : Sepher ha-Shomeronim (Hebrew), Tell Aviv, 1935.
- BENZINGER, I. : Die Bücher der Könige, 1899.
- Die Bücher der Chronik, 1901.
- Jahvist u. Elohist in den Königsbüchern, *BWAT*, N.F., 2 (1921).
- Hebräische Archäologie, ed. 3, 1927.
- Israel, *RGG*.
- BERGSTRÄSSER, G. : Hebräische Grammatik, ed. 29 of Gesenius, 2 parts, 1918-29 (unfinished) [*HG*].
- BERLINGER, J. : Die Peschitta zum 1. Buche der Könige u. ihr Verhältniss zu Mas. Texte, LXX, u. Targum, 1897.
- BEROSSOS : *FHG* 2, 495 ff.
- P. Schnabel, Berossos u. die babylonisch-hellenistische Literatur, 1923.

- BERTHOLET, A. : Kings, in *HSAT*.
 — History of Hebrew Civilization, 1926, tr. of Kulturgeschichte Israels, 1920.
- BEVAN, E. R., and SINGER, C. : The Legacy of Israel, 1928 (see the cc. on Hebrew studies in the Middle Ages and in and after the Reformation period by Singer and G. H. Box).
- BEWER, J. A. : The Literature of the O.T. in its Historical Development, rev. ed., 1933.
- BEZOLD, C. : Babylonisch-assyrisches Glossar, ed. by A. Götze, 1926 [*BAG*].
- BIRKELAND, H. : Akzent u. Vocalismus im Althebräischen. Mit Beiträgen zur vergleichenden semitischen Sprachwissenschaft, 1940.
- BLEEK, F. : Einleitung in das A.T., ed. 1, 1860 ; ed. 4, 1878, ed. by J. Wellhausen ; ed. 5, 1886. ed. by Wellhausen, but reverting to Bleek's conservative positions ; see Wellhausen, Composition.
- BORÉE, W., Die alten Ortsnamen Palästinas, 1930 [*AOP*].
- BOSTRÖM, O. H. : Alternative Readings in the Hebrew of the Books of Samuel, 1918.
- BÖTTCHER, F. : Neue exegetisch-kritische Aehrenlese zum A.T., Abt. 1-3, 1863-65.
 — Ausführliches Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprache, vol. 1, 1866.
- BOX, G. H. : see Bevan.
- BREASTED, J. H. : Ancient Records of Egypt, 1906-07 [*ARE*].
 — A History of Egypt, 1905 [*HE*].
- BRIGGS, C. A. : General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture, 1899.
 — see Brown-Driver-Briggs.
- BROCKELMANN, C. : Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen, 2 vols., 1908-13 [*GVG*].
 — Lexicon syriacum, ed. 2, 1928.
- BROOKE, A. E., McLEAN, N., and THACKERAY, H. ST. J. : The O.T. in Greek, Cambridge, 1906-40, so far as issued ; vol. 2, part 2, Kings, 1930 [*OTG*].
- BROWN, F., DRIVER, S. R., and BRIGGS, C. A. : A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the O.T., etc. (based on Robinson's ed. of The Lexicon Gesenius), 1906 [*BDB*].
- BRUNO, A. : Das hebräische Epos, eine rhythmische u. textkritische Untersuchung der Bücher Samuelis u. Könige, 1935.
- BUBER, M. : Königtum Gottes, ed. 2, 1936.
- BUDDE, K. : Geschichte der althebräischen Literatur, 1906 [*GAL*].
- BUHL, F. : Canon and Text of the O.T., Eng. tr., 1892.
 — Geschichte der Edomiter, 1893.
 — Geographie der alten Palästina, 1896 [*GAP*].
 — Die socialen Verhältnisse der Israeliten, 1899.
 — see Gesenius.
- Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research. Bibliographical and Topographical Indices, nos. 50, 74, 76, 80 [*BASOR*], 1933-40.

- BURKITT, F. C. : Fragments of the Books of Kings according to the Translation of Aquila, 1897.
 — Texts and Versions, *EB*.
 — see T. H. Robinson.
- BURNEY, C. F. : Kings I and II, *DB*.
 — Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Book of Kings, 1903.
 — The Book of Judges, ed. 2, 1920.
- BURROWS, M. : What Mean these Stones ? 1941 [*WMTS*].
- CALMET, A. : La Sainte Bible en Latin et en Français avec un commentaire littéral et critique, 23 vols., 1707 *seq.*
 — Commentaire littéral sur tous les livres de l'Ancien et du Nouveau Testament, 1724-26.
- Cambridge Ancient History : edd. J. B. Bury, S. A. Cook, F. E. Adcock. Vol. 3, 1925, cc. 1-4, S. Smith, Assyria ; cc. 6, 7, D. C. Hogarth, Hittites ; ch. 9, R. C. Thompson, New Babylonian Empire ; ch. 16, R. A. S. Macalister, Topography of Jerusalem ; cc. 17-20, Cook, Israel and the Neighbouring States [*CAH*].
- CAPELLUS, S. : Chronologia sacra, and, Trisagion sive templi Hierosolymitani triplex delineatio, including discussion of Josephus, translation of *Middoth*, and Maimonides's notes ; in Walton's Polyglot, reprinted in Walton's *Biblicus Apparatus*.
- CAUSSE, A. : Du groupe ethnique à la communauté religieuse : le problème sociologique de la religion d'Israël, 1937.
- CHADWICK, H. M., and N. K. : The Growth of Literature ; vol. 2, part iv, Early Hebrew Literature, 1936.
- CHEYNE, T. K. : *Critica Biblica* ; part iv, First and Second Kings, 1903.
 — Decline and Fall of the Kingdom of Judah, 1908.
 — arts. in *EB*.
- CHURCH, B. P. : The Israel Saga, 1932.
- CLAY, A. T. : Light on the O.T. from Babel, 1907.
- CLEMEN, C. : Die phönikische Religion nach Philo von Byblos, *MVAG* 42, Heft 3, 1939.
 — see Lucian.
- CLERMONT-GANNEAU, C. : Recueil d'archéologie orientale, 8 vols., 1888-1924.
 Comptes rendus, l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres [*CR*].
- CONTENAU, G. : La civilisation phénicienne, 1926.
 — Manuel d'archéologie orientale, 4 vols., 1927-47.
- CONTI ROSSINI, C. : *Chrestomathia Arabica meridionalis epigraphica*, 1931.
- COOK, S. A. : Jews, *Enc. Br.* 14.
 — Notes on the Dynasties of Omri and Jehu, *JQR* 20 (1908), 597-630.
 — The Religion of Ancient Palestine in the Light of Archæology, 1930.
 — Salient Problems in O.T. History, *JBL* 41 (1932), 273-99.
 — The Confines of Israel and Judah, *QS* 1934, 60-75.

- COOK, S. A. : The O.T., a Reinterpretation, 1936.
 — see *CAH*.
- COOKE, G. A. : A Text-Book of North-Semitic Inscriptions, 1903 [*NSI*].
 — Ezekiel, *ICC* 1937.
- COPPENS, J. : L'Histoire critique de l'Ancien Testament, 1938 ; ed. 3, 1942.
- CORNILL, C. H. : Introduction to the Canonical Books of the O.T., 1907, tr. of Einleitung in das A.T., ed. 5, 1905.
 Corpus inscriptionum Semiticarum, 1881 seq. [*CIS*].
 Corpus scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, 1903 seq. [*CSCO*].
 Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Græcorum, 1897 seq. [*CSEG*].
 Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum, 1866 seq. [*CSEL*].
 Cory's Ancient Fragments, etc., tr. and ed. by F. R. Hodges, 1876.
- COWLEY, A. : Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C., 1923.
- CREELMAN, H. : An Introduction to the O.T., Chronologically Arranged, 1917.
- CREMER, H. : Biblisch-theologisches Wörterbuch der neutestamentlichen Gräcität, ed. 6, 1889 ; ed. 11, rev. by J. Kögel, 1923.
- Critici sacri, ed. C. Bee, 1696 seq.
- CROCKETT, W. D. : A Harmony of the Books of Sam., Ki., and Chron., 1907.
- CROWFOOT, J. W., KENYON, F., and SUKENIK, E. L. : The Buildings of Samaria, 1942.
- CUNY, A. : see Féghali.
- CURTIS, E. L., and MADSEN, A. A. : Chronicles, *ICC* 1910.
- DALMAN, G. : Arbeit u. Sitte in Palästina, 7 vols., 1928-42 [*A.u.S.*].
 — Sacred Sites and Ways, 1935.
- DATHIUS (DATHE), J. A. : Libri historici V.T. (tr. with notes), 1784 ; ed. 2, 1832.
- DE WETTE, W. M. L. : Lehrbuch der historisch-kritischen Einleitung in die Bibel, A. u. N.T., vol. 1, ed. 6, 1845, vol. 2, ed. 4, 1842 ; ed. 8, ed. E. Schrader, 1869.
- DEIMEL, A. : Pantheon Babylonicum, 1914.
 — Analecta Orientalia 12 (dedicated to), 1935.
- DELITZSCH, FRANZ : A System of Biblical Psychology, 1867.
- DELITZSCH, FRIEDR. : Assyrisches Handwörterbuch, 1896.
 — Die Lese- u. Schreibfehler im A.T., 1920.
- DELLA VIDA, G. L. : arts., Aramei, Ebrei, Semiti, in Enciclopedia Italiana, vol. 3, 1929, vol. 14, 1932, vol. 34, 1936.
- DESNOYERS, L. : Histoire du peuple hébreu, 3 vols., 1922-30.
- DHORME, E. (=P.) : Les livres de Samuel, 1910.
 — Les pays bibliques et l'Assyrie, a series of arts. in *RB* 7, 8 (1910-11).
 — Prêtres, devins et mages dans l'ancienne religion des Hébreux, *RHR* 108 (1933), 113-43.
 — L'Évolution religieuse d'Israël, 1937.
- A Dictionary of the Bible, ed. James Hastings, 4 vols. and extra vol., 1898-1904 [*DB*].

- A Dictionary of Christian Biography, edd. W. Smith and H. Wace, 4 vols., 1877-87 [DCB].
- DILLMANN, A. : Biblia V.T. Æthiopica, vol. 2, 1861.
— Lexicon linguæ Æthiopicæ, 1865.
- DIRINGER, D. : Le iscrizioni antico-ebraiche palestinesi, 1934 [IAE].
- DÖLLER, J. : Geographische u. ethnographische Studien zum III. u. IV. Buche der Könige, 1904 [GES].
- DENNEFELD, L. : Histoire d'Israël et de l'Ancien Orient, 1935.
- DOUGHTY, C. M. : Travels in Arabia Deserta, ed. 3, 1927.
- DOZY, R. : Supplément aux dictionnaires arabes, 2 vols., 1881.
- DRIVER, S. R. : A Treatise on the Use of the Tenses in Hebrew, etc. 1892.
— An Introduction to the Literature of the O.T., ed. 6, 1900 (=Am. ed. 10) ; New Ed., 1913 (Am. reprint, 1931).
— Deuteronomy, ICC 1895.
— Notes on the Hebrew Text and the Topography of the Books of Samuel, ed. 2, 1913.
— see Brown-Driver-Briggs.
- DUHM, B. : Die Edomiter, 1893.
- DÜRR, L. : Die Wertung des göttlichen Wortes im A.T. u. im antiken Orient, MVÄG 42, Heft I, 1938.
- DUSSAUD, R. : Notes de mythologie syrienne, ii-ix, 1905.
— Samarie au temps d'Achab, Syria, 6 (1925), 314-38 ; 7 (1926), 9-29.
— Topographie historique de la Syrie antique et médiévale, 1927 [TH].
— DESCHAMPS, P., and SEYRIG, H. : La Syrie antique et médiévale illustrée (with 160 plates and map), 1931 [SAM].
— Mélanges syriens, offerts à M. . . , I, 1939, II, 1939.
- DUVAL, R. : Traité de grammaire syriaque, 1881.
— La littérature syriaque, ed. 3, 1907.
- EBELING, E. : see Gressmann.
- EBSTEIN, W. : Die Medizin im A.T., 1901.
- EHRlich, A. B. : Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel ; on Kings, vol. 7, pp. 213 ff., 1914.
- EICHHORN, J. G. : Einleitung in das A.T., ed. 4, 5 vols., 1823-24.
- EISSFELDT, O. : Könige, HSAT, ed. 4, 1922-23.
— The Smallest Literary Unit in the Narrative Books of the O.T. Simpson, O.T. Essays, 85 ff.
— Die Komposition der Samuelisbücher, 1931.
— Einleitung in das A.T., 1934.
— Philister u. Phönizier, AO 1936.
— Phöniker u. Phönikia, RE 1940.
— Geschichtsschreibung im A.T. Ein Kritischer Bericht über die neueste Literatur dazu, 1948.
— Altertumskunde u. A.T., in Werden und Wesen des A.T., BZAW 66 (1936), 155-67.

- EISSFELDT, O.: Ba'alšamēm u. Jahwe, *ZAW* 57 (1939), 1 ff.
 — Ras Schamra und Sanchunjaton, 1939.
 — Israelitisch-philistäische Grenzverschiebungen von David bis auf die Assyrerzeit, *ZDPV* 66 (1943), 115–28.
 — see Kittel, *BH*.
- EITAN, I.: Hebrew and Semitic Particles, *AJSL* 44 (1928), 177–205, 254–60; 45 (1928–29), 48–60, 130–45, 197–211; 46 (1929), 22–51.
Encyclopædia Biblica, edd. T. K. Cheyne and J. S. Black, 4 vols., 1899–1903, one vol. ed., 1914 [*EB*].
Encyclopædia Britannica, ed. 9, 1878; ed. 14, 1929 [*Enc. Br.*].
Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics, ed. J. Hastings, 1917–27 [*ERE*].
- EPHRAEM SYRUS: Opera omnia S. Ephraemi Syri, ed. Petrus Benedictus, vol. 1, 439–567 on Kings, 1737.
- ERBT, W.: Elia, Elisa, Jona. Beitrag zur Geschichte der 9. u. 8. Jahrhundert, 1907.
- ERMAN, A.: Literature of the Ancient Egyptians, tr. by A. W. Blackman, 1927.
 — and RANKE, H.: Aegypten u. aegyptisches Leben im Altertum, ed. 2, 1923.
- EULER, K. F.: Königtum u. Götterwelt in den altaramäischen Inschriften Nordsyriens, *ZAW* 57 (1939), 272 ff.
- EUSEBIUS PAMPHILI: *Chronicorum libri duo*, ed. A. C. I. Schoene, 1866, 1875.
 — E. Klostermann, Das Onomastikon der biblischen Ortsnamen (with Jerome's Latin text), *GCS* 11 (1904).
 — F. Wutz, *Onomastica Sacra*, *TU* 41 (1915).
- EUTING, J.: see *Ausgrabungen in Sendschirli*.
- EWALD, H.: Ausführliches Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Bundes, ed. 8, 1870.
 — History of Israel, Eng. tr. by R. Martineau, 1869–86 [*HI*].
- FABRICIUS, J. A.: *Codex pseudepigraphicus Veteris Testamenti*, Hamburg/Leipzig, 1713.
- FARRAR, F. W.: *History of Interpretation*, New York, 1886.
 — *The first Book of Kings*, 1893; *The Second Book of Kings*, 1894 (*Expositor's Bible*).
- AL-FĀSĪ, DAVID B. ABRAHAM: *Kitāb jāmi' al-alfāz*, ed. S. L. Skoss, vol. 1, New Haven, 1936; vol. 2, New Haven, 1945.
- FÉGHALI, M., and CUNY, A.: *Du genre grammatical en sémitique*, 1924.
- FEIGIN, S.: *Misstre Heavar*, *Biblical and Historical Studies (Hebrew)*, 1943.
- FIELD, F.: *Origenis hexaplorum quæ supersunt*, 2 vols., 1875.
- FILLION, L.: *Rois (Les quatre livres des)*, Vigouroux, *DB*.
 — *Poids*, *ib*.
- FINEGAN, J.: *Light from the Ancient East—The Archæological Background of the Hebrew-Christian Religion*, 1946.

- FISHER, C. S. : see Lyon.
- FORRER, E. : Die Provinzeinteilung des assyrischen Reiches, Teil I, 1920.
 — Aramu, *RA*.
 — Assyrien, *RA*.
- FOWLER, H. T. : A History of the Literature of Ancient Israel, 1912.
 — Herodotus and the Early Hebrew Historians, *JBL* 49 (1930), 207-17.
- Fragmenta historicorum Græcorum, edd. K. and T. Müller, 5 vols., 1848-74 [*FHG*].
- FRAZER, J. G. : Folk-Lore in the O.T., 3 vols., 1918.
 — The Golden Bough, ed. 3, 12 vols., 1911-15; Supplementary Vol., 1937.
- FREYTAG, G. W. : Lexicon Arabico-Latinum, 4 vols., 1830-37.
- GADD, J. C. : see Hall.
- GALLING, K. : Die israelitische Staatsverfassung in ihrer vorderasiatischen Umwelt, *AO* 28, Heft 3/4, 1929.
 — Biblisches Reallexicon, 1937 [*BR*].
- GANDZ, S. : Oral Tradition in the Bible, Jewish Studies in Memory of G. A. Kohut, 1935, 248-69.
 — The Dawn of Literature: Prolegomena to a History of Unwritten Literature, *Osiris* 7 (1939), 261 ff.
- GARSTANG, J. : Sociology of Ancient Palestine, 1934.
 — The Heritage of Solomon, 1934.
 — see Lucian.
- Gaster Anniversary Volume, 1936.
- GEDEN, A. S., and KILGOUR, R. : Introduction to the Ginsburg Edition of the Hebrew O.T., 1928.
- GEHMAN, H. S. : ed., The Westminster Dictionary of the Bible, 1944.
 — The Armenian Version of I and II Kings and its Affinities, *JAOS* 54 (1934), 53-9.
- GEIGER, A. : Urschrift u. Übersetzungen der Bibel, ed. 2, 1928.
- VAN GELDEREN, C. : Die Boeken van Koningen, 3 vols., 1936-47.
- GESENIUS (H. F.), W. : Thesaurus philologicus criticus linguae Hebraeae et Chaldaeae Veteris Testamenti, 3 vols., 1829-53.
 — Hebräische Grammatik, ed. 26, ed. E. Kautzsch, 1896; ed. 28, 1909 [*GK*].
 — Eng. tr. by A. Cowley, Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar, ed. 2, 1910.
 — and BUHL, F. : Hebräisches u. aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das A.T., ed. 16, 1915 (the edd. of 1921 and 1933 are unchanged reprints) [*GB*].
 — see Brown-Driver-Briggs.
- GILLESCHESKI, EVA : Der Ausdruck עם הארץ im A.T., *ZAW* 40 (1922), 137-42.
- GINSBURG (C.), D. : Introduction to the Massoretico-Critical Edition of the Hebrew Bible, 1897.

- GINSBURG, (C.), D.: The Hebrew Old Testament: עשרים וארבעה ספרי הקדש, 1894 [Ginsb.¹]
 — The Old Testament: תורה נביאים וכתובים, 4 vols., 1926. [Ginsb.²].
- GINZBERG, L.: Legends of the Jews, 7 vols., 1909–38, esp. vol. 4; vol. 7 contains Index by Boaz Cohen.
- GIRON: see Aimé-Giron.
- GLUECK, N.: Explorations in Eastern Palestine: I, *AASOR* 14 (1934); II, *ib.*, 15 (1935); III, *ib.*, 18–19 (1939); also constant reports in *BASOR* and *BA*.
 — The Boundaries of Edom, *HUCA* 11 (1936), 141 ff.
 — The Other Side of the Jordan, 1940.
 — The River Jordan—being an Account of the Earth's most Storied River, 1946.
- GODLEY, A. D.: see Herodotus.
- GOETTSBERGER, J.: Einleitung in das A.T., 1928.
 — Die Bücher der Chronik, 1938.
- GORDIS, R.: The Biblical Text in the Making: A Study of the Kethib-Qre, 1937.
- GRAETZ, H.: Geschichte der Juden, 1853–70; Eng. tr., History of the Jews, 6 vols., 1891.
 — Emendationes in V.T., 1892.
- GRAHAM, W. C., and MAY, H. G.: Culture and Conscience: an Archaeological Study of the New Religious Past in Ancient Palestine, 1936.
- GRANT, E.: see Haverford Symposium.
- GRAY, G. B.: Studies in Hebrew Proper Names, 1896.
 — Critical Introduction to the O.T., 1913.
- GRESSMANN, H.: Samuel, *SAT* 1921.
 — Könige, *ib.*
 — Die älteste Geschichtsschreibung u. Prophetie Israels, ed. 2, 1921.
 — Altorientalische Texte u. Bilder zum A.T.², in conjunction with E. Ebeling, H. Ranke, N. Rhodokanakis, 2 vols., 1926–27 [*ATB*].
- GREYER, O.: Name u. Wort Gottes im A.T., *BZAW* 64 (1934).
 Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte, 1897 seq. [*CGS*].
- GROHMANN, A.: see Nielsen, *HAA*.
- GROTIUS, H.: Annotationes in V.T., 3 vols., 1775–76; also *Variæ lectiones*, ed. by T. Pierce, in Walton's Polyglot, vol. 6.
- GUÉRIN, M. V.: Description . . . de la Palestine. Part I, Judée, 1868–69; part II, Samarie, 1874–75; Galilée, 1880.
- Guide Bleu: Syrie, Palestine, 1932.
- GUILLAUME, A.: Kings, in A New Commentary on Holy Scripture, edd. C. Gore, *al.*, 1928.
 — Prophecy and Divination, 1938.
- GUNKEL, H.: Die Psalmen, 1926.
 — Einleitung in die Psalmen, 1933.
 — Sagen u. Legenden: II. In Israel, *RGG*.
 — see Religion in Geschichte u. Gegenwart.

- Gunkel-Eucharisterion, ed. H. Schmidt, 1923.
- GÜTERBOCK, H. G. : Die historische Tradition u. ihre literarische Gestaltung bei Babyloniern u. Hethitern bis 1200, Teil I, Babylo-
nier, Teil II, Hethiter, *ZA* 42 (1934), 1-91; *ib.*, 44 (1938), 45 ff.
- GUTHE, H. : Geschichte Israels, ed. 2, 1904.
- HAEUSSERMANN, F. : Wortempfang in der alttestamentlichen Prophetie,
BZAW 58 (1932).
- HALL, R. H. : Ancient History of the Near East, ed. 3, 1916; ed. 8,
ed. J. C. Gadd, 1932 [*AHNE*].
- HAMBURGER, J. : Real-Encyclopädie für Bibel u. Talmud, 2 vols.,
1870-83 [*RE*].
- A Handbook of Arabia. British Admiralty publication, n. d. (*post*
1914).
- Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft [*HA*].
- HARDING, L. : see Lachish, I, II.
- HARMAN, A. M. : see Lucian.
- HARRIS, C. W. : The Hebrew Heritage : a Study of Israel's Cultural
and Spiritual Origins, 1935.
- HARRIS, Z. S. : A Grammar of the Phœnician Language, 1936.
- Development of the Canaanite Dialects, 1939.
- HATCH, E., and REDPATH, H. A. : Concordance to the Septuagint,
etc., 2 vols., 1897 (Suppl. Vol., 1906).
- HAUCK, A. : see Realencyklopädie.
- HAUPT, P. : see Stade, *SBOT*.
- Oriental Studies . . . in Commemoration of . . ., 1926.
- The Haverford Symposium on Archæology and the Bible, ed. E.
Grant, New Haven, 1938.
- HEMPEL, J. : Das A.T. u. Geschichte, 1930.
- Die althebräische Literatur u. ihr hellenistisches Nachleben, 1930
[*AL*].
- Politische Absicht u. politische Wirkung im biblischen Schrifttum,
1938.
- HERODOTUS : ed. A. D. Godley, Loeb Classical Library, 4 vols., 1921-24.
- HERRMANN, A. : Die Erdkarte der Urbibel, 1931.
- HERZOG, J. J. : see Realencyklopädie.
- HEYSE, T., and TISCHENDORF, C. : Biblia Sacra Latina, 1873 (cited
as Tischendorf).
- HITTI, P. K. : History of the Arabs, 1937; ed. 3, 1943.
- HITZIG, F. : Geschichte des Volkes Israel, 1869.
- HÖFNER, M. : Altsüdarabische Grammatik, 1943.
- HOGARTH, D. C. : see *CAH*.
- HOLMES, R., and PARSONS, J. : V.T. Græcum cum variis lectionibus,
4 vols., 1798-1827 [*HP*].
- HÖLSCHER, G. : Das Buch der Könige, seine Quellen u. seine Redaktion
(Gunkel-Eucharisterion, I, 158 ff.), 1923.
- Die Anfänge der hebräischen Geschichtsschreibung (*Sb.*, Heidel-
berg), 1942.

- HOMMEL, F. : Süd-Arabische Chrestomathie, 1893.
 — Ethnologie u. Geographie des Alten Orients, 1926 [*E.G.A.O.*].
 — see Nielsen, *H.A.A.*
- HONEYMAN, A. M. : The Pottery Vessels of the O.T., *PEQ* 1939, 76-90.
- HONIGMANN, E. : Syria, *RE* 4 (A), 1549 ff.
- HOOKE, S. H. : ed., Myth and Ritual of the Hebrews in Relation to the Culture Pattern of the Ancient East, 1933.
 — ed., The Labyrinth, 1935.
- HOSCHANDER, J. : The Priests and Prophets, 1938.
- HOUBIGANT, C. F. : Notae criticae in universos V.T. libros, etc., 2 vols., Frankfurt, 1777.
- HUGHES, T. P. : A Dictionary of Islam, 1885.
- HUNKIN, J. W. : see T. H. Robinson.
- INGE, C. H. : see Lachish II.
- JACK, J. W. : Samaria in Ahab's Time. Harvard Excavations and their Results, 1929.
 — The Lachish Letters : Their Date and Import, *PEQ* 1938, 165-87.
- JACOB, E. : La tradition historique en Israël, 1946.
- JAMES, F. : Personalities of the O.T., 1939.
- JASTROW, MARCUS : A Dictionary of the Targumim, Talmud Babilii and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature, 2 vols., 1903.
- JASTROW, MORRIS : Die Religion Babylonien u. Assyriens, 2 vols., 1905-12.
- JEAN, C. F. : Le milieu biblique avant Jésus-Christ, 3 vols., 1922-36.
- JEPSEN, A. : Nabi. Soziologische Studien zur alttestamentlichen Literatur u. Religionsgeschichte, 1934.
- JEREMIAS, A. : Das A.T. im Lichte des alten Orients, ed. 2, 1906 (ed. 4, 1930); e.g., the Solomonic history, pp. 492 ff., Glosses on Ki., pp. 537 ff. [*ATL.A.O.*].
 — Handbuch d. altorientalischen Geisteskultur, ed. 2, 1929 [*H.A.G.*].
- JEROME : Onomasticon ; see Eusebius.
- Jewish Encyclopædia, 12 vols., 1901-06 [*J.E.*].
- JIRKU, A. : Altorientalischer Kommentar zum A.T., 1923 [*AKAT.*].
 — Die ägyptischen Liste paläst. u. syr. Ortsnamen, 1937.
 — Der Kampf um Syrien-Palästina im orientalischen Altertum, 1926.
 — Geschichte des Volkes Israel, 1931.
- JOHNSON, A. R. : Rôle of the King in the Jerusalem Cultus, in Hooke, The Labyrinth, 1935.
- JOSEPHUS : H. St.J. Thackeray and R. Marcus, Loeb Library, Marcus ed. of vols. 5, 6, 1934-37.
- JOÜON, P. : Notes de critique textuelle, *Mél.*, 5, fasc. 2 (1912), 473 ff., on Kings.
 — Grammaire de l'Hébreu biblique, 1923.
 — Notes philologiques sur le texte hébreu de 1 Rois, etc., *Biblica*, 9 (1928), 428-33.

- JUNGE, E. : Der Wiederaufbau des Heerwesens des Reiches Juda unter Josia, *BWANT* IV, 23 (1937).
- JUNKER, H. : Prophet u. Seher im Israel, 1927.
- KAHLE, P. : Der alttestamentliche Bibeltext (text in Palestine 600-900, in Babylonia 900-1525), *Th.R.*, N.F., 5 (1933), 227-38.
 — The Cairo Geniza (Schweich Lectures, 1941), 1946.
 — see Kittel, *BH*.
- KALT, E. : Biblisches Reallexikon, ed. 2, 2 vols., 1938-39.
- KAMPHAUSEN, A. : Könige, *HSAT* 1894.
- KAUTZSCH, E. : An Outline of the History of the Literature of the O.T., Eng. tr., 1899.
 — Die Heilige Schrift des A.T., ed. 4, ed. A. Bertholet, 2 vols., 1922-23 [*HSAT*].
 — see Gesenius, GK.
 — see W. R. Smith.
- KEIL, C. F. : Die Bücher der Könige, ed. 2, 1876 ; tr. of ed. 1 by J. Martin, 2 vols., 1872.
- KENNEDY, J. : An Aid to the Textual Amendment of the O.T., 1928.
- KENNETT, R. H. : O.T. Essays, 1928.
 — Ancient Hebrew Social Life and Custom, etc., 1933.
- KENNICOTT, J. : Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum cum variis lectionibus, 2 vols., 1776-80 ; cf. his Dissertatio generalis at end of vol. 2 [*VTH*].
 — The Ten Annual Accounts of the O.T. (1760-69), 1770 (detailed reports on progress of the work on *VTH*).
- KENT, C. F. : The Student's O.T. ; vol. 2, Israel's Historical and Biographical Narratives, 1905 [*SOT*].
- KIMCHI, DAVID : cited from *Mikra'oth Gedoloth*.
- KITTEL, R. : Die Anfänge der hebräischen Geschichtsschreibung im A.T., 1896.
 — Die Bücher der Könige, *HkAT* 1900.
 — Studien zur hebräischen Archäologie u. Religionsgeschichte, 1908.
 — Richter, Samuel, *HSAT* 1922.
 — Geschichte des Volkes Israel, ed. 6, vols. 1, 2, 1923-25 [*GVI*].
 — Biblia Hebraica (and Hebrew title), ed. 1, 1905-06 ; ed. 3, ed. Alt, Eissfeldt ; Kahle ed. Masoretic text ; Kings by Kittel, Noth, 1934 (see Int. *infra*, §2) ; 1929-37 [*BH*].
- KLOSTERMANN, A. : Die Bücher Samuelis u. der Könige, in Strack and Zöckler, Kgf. Kommentar, 1887.
 — see Eusebius, Origen.
- KOHUT, G. A. : Jewish Studies in Memory of ; ed. S. W. Baron and A. Marx, 1935.
- KOEHLER, L., and BAUMGARTNER, W. : Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros, 1948 —.
- KÖNIG, E. : Historisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache, 2 half-vols., 1881-95.
 — Historisch-comparative Syntax der hebräischen Sprache, 1897.

- KÖNIG, E. : Einleitung in das A.T., 1893.
 — Hebräisches u. aramäisches Wörterbuch zum A.T., 1910 [*HAW*].
 — Prophecy, *ERE*.
 KRAELING, E. G. H. : Aram and Israel, 1918.
 KRAETZSCHMAR, R. : Prophet u. Seher im alten Israel, 1901.
 KUENEN, A. : Historisch-kritische Einleitung in die Bücher des A.T.,
 tr. of ed. 2 of the Dutch, 2 vols., 1887-92.
- LABAT, R. : Le caractère religieux de la royauté assyro-babylonienne,
 1931.
 Lachish I, see Torczyner. Lachish II, The Fosse Temple, edd. O.
 Tufnell, C. H. Inge, L. Harding, 1940.
 DE LAGARDE, P. : Targum Chaldaice, 1872.
 — Librorum V.T. canonicorum pars prior Græce, 1883.
 — Bibliothecæ Syriacæ (posthumously completed by A. Rahlfs),
 1892.
- LANDERSDORFER, S. : Die Bücher der Könige, 1927.
 LANE, E. W. : An Arabic-English Lexicon, 1863-93, unfinished.
 LANGDON, S. H. : Mythology of All Races, vol. 5, Semitic, 1931.
 A LAPIDE, C. : Commentaria in Scripturam Sacram, Editio Nova,
 vols. 3, 4, 1868.
 Die lateinischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte,
 1866 seq. [*LCS*].
 LE JAY, G. M. : Biblia Sacra polyglotta, Paris, 1629-45.
 LE STRANGE, G. : Palestine under the Moslems, 1890.
 LEANDER, P. : see Bauer.
 LEHMANN-HAUPT, C. F. : Israel, seine Entwicklung im Rahmen der
 Weltgeschichte, 1911.
 LENORMANT, F. : Histoire ancienne de l'Orient jusqu' aux guerres
 médiques, ed. 9, 1881-88.
 LEWY, J. : Forschungen zur alten Geschichte Vorderasiens, *MVÄG* 29,
 Heft 2, 1925.
 LIBER, M. : Rashi, Eng. tr. by Adele Szold, 1938.
 LIDDELL, H. G., and SCOTT, R. : A Greek-English Lexicon, 1882 ;
 new ed., by H. S. Jones, *et al.*, 1925-40.
 LIDZBARSKI, M. : Handbuch der nordsemitischen Epigraphik, 1898
 [*HNE*].
 — Ephemeris für semitische Epigraphik, 3 vols., 1902-15 [*Eph.*].
 — Altsemitische Texte, Heft 1, Kanaanäische Inschriften, 1907
 [*AT*].
 — Altaramäische Urkunden aus Assur, 1921.
 LIGHTBOURNE, F. C. : The Story in the O.T., *ATR* 21 (1939),
 94-102.
 LIGHTFOOT, J. : The Whole Works of, ed. J. P. Pitman, 13 vols.,
 1822-25, vol. 2, pp. 192-303, on Kings.
 LINDBLOM, J. : Zur Frage der Eigenart der alttestamentlichen Religion,
 in Werden und Wesen des A.T., *BZAW* 66 (1936), 128-37.

- Lods, A. : L'Ange de Jahwé et " l'âme extérieure," in Marti, K., Studien zur sem. Philologie u. Religionsgeschichte, *BZAW* 27 (1914), 263-78.
- La rôle de la tradition orale dans la formation des récits de l'Ancien Testament, *RHR* 88 (1923), 51-64.
- La rôle des idées magiques dans la mentalité Israélite, O.T. Essays, Simpson ed.
- La Religion d'Israël, 1939.
- Israël : des origines au VIII^e siècle, 1930.
- LÖHR, M. : see Thenius.
- LUCIAN OF SAMOSATA : De Dea Syra ; text and tr., A. M. Harman, vol. 4 of Lucian, Loeb Library, 1925 ; tr. with comm., H. A. Strong and J. Garstang, The Syrian Goddess, 1913 ; tr. with notes, C. Clemen, Lukians Schrift über die syrische Göttin, *AO* 37, 3/4, 1938.
- LUCIFER OF CALARIS : *CSEL*, vol. 14, ed. Hartel ; Migne, *PL*, vol. 13.
- LUCKENBILL, D. D. : The Annals of Sennacherib, 1924.
- Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia, 2 vols., 1926-27 [*ARA*].
- LURJE, W. : Studien zur Geschichte der wirtschaftlichen u. sozialen Verhältnisse im israelitisch-jüdischen Reiche, *BZAW* 45 (1927).
- VON LUSCHAN, F. : see Ausgrabungen in Sendschirli.
- LYON, D. G., REISNER, G., and FISHER, C. S. : Harvard Excavations at Samaria, 2 vols., 1924.
- DE LYRA, NICOLAS : Migne, *SSCC*, vol. 20, 1879 ; cf. De la Haye, Biblia Maxima, seu Lyrani, Menochii et Tirini in Danielelem Annotationes.
- MACALISTER, R. A. S. : The Excavation of Gezer, 3 vols., 1912.
- A Century of Excavations in Palestine, 1925.
- see *CAH*.
- MACDONALD, D. B. : The Hebrew Literary Genius, 1933.
- MADSEN, A. A. : see Curtis.
- MAIMONIDES : see Capellus.
- MAISLER, B. : Toledoth Eres Yisrael (History of Palestine), Tell Aviv, vol. 1, 1938.
- MANDELKERN, S. : Veteris Testamenti concordantiæ Hebraicæ atque Chaldaicæ, ed. 2, 1925.
- MANSON, T. W. : ed., A Companion to the Bible, 1939 (in particular the contributions by H. H. Rowley and T. H. Robinson).
- MARCUS, R. : see Josephus.
- MARGOLIOUTH, D. S. : The Relations between Arabs and Israelites Prior to the Rise of Islam, 1924.
- MARGOLIS, M. L. : The Story of Bible Translations, 1917.
- Notes on the New Translation of the Holy Scriptures. Edited and typewritten by H. S. Linfield, Jewish Publ. Soc. of Am., 1921 (for private circulation—of particular value for citation of Jewish commentators).
- Hebrew Scriptures in the Making, 1922.

- MASPERO, G. C. C. : The Passing of the Empires, 850 B.C. to 330 B.C., Eng. tr., 1900.
- MATTHEWS, I. G. : Commentary on I and II Samuel, 1929.
 — O.T. Life and Literature, new ed., 1934.
 — The Religious Pilgrimage of Israel, 1947.
- MAY, H. G. : see Graham.
- MAYNARD, J. A. : Seven Years of O.T. Study, a Critical Bibliography of O.T. Research from 1917 to 1924, 1927.
- MCCOWN, C. C. : The Ladder of Progress in Palestine, 1943.
- MCLEAN, N. : see Brooke, *OTG*.
- MEEK, T. J. : Hebrew Origins, 1936; ed. 2, 1950.
- MEINHOLD, J. : Einführung in das A.T., ed. 3, 1932.
- MEISSNER, B. E. : Babylonien u. Assyrien, 2 vols., 1920-25.
 — Könige Babylonien u. Assyrer, 1926.
 — see Reallexicon der Assyriologie.
- MENDELSON, I. : Guilds in Babylonia and Assyria, *JAOS* 60 (1940), 68-72.
 — Guilds in Ancient Palestine, *BASOR* 80 (1940), 17-21.
 — State Slavery in Ancient Palestine, *BASOR* 85 (1942), 14-17.
- MENES, A. : Die vorexilischen Gesetze Israels im Zusammenhang seiner kulturgeschichtlichen Entwicklung, *BZAW* 50 (1928).
- MEYER, E. : Die Israeliten u. ihre Nachbarstämme, 1906 [*IN*].
 — Kleine Schriften, 1910.
 — Geschichte des Altertums, vol. 1, ed. 2 (2 half-vols.), 1907-09; vol. 2, ed. 2 (2 half-vols., the second half posthumously ed. by H. E. Stier), 1928-31 [*GA*].
 — Die kulturelle, literarische u. religiöse Entwicklung des israelitischen Volkes in der älteren Königszeit, *Sb.*, Preuss. Akad., Berlin, 1930, 66-77.
- MICHAELIS, J. H. : Biblia Hebraica ex aliquot MSS., etc., Magdeburg, 1720.
- MIGNE, J. P. : Patrologia Græca, 1857 seq. [*PG*].
 — Patrologia Latina, 1844 seq. [*PL*].
 — Scripturæ Sacræ cursus completus, 1866 seq. [*SSCC*].
- Mikra'oth Gedoloth, Warsaw ed., part 8, 1874.
- MÖLLER, W. : Einleitung in das A.T., 1934.
- MONTGOMERY, J. A. : The Samaritans, 1907.
 — Daniel, *ICC* 1927.
 — Arabia and the Bible, 1934.
 — The Year Eponymate in the Hebrew History, *JBL* 49 (1930), 311-19.
 — Archival Data in the Book of Kings, *ib.*, 53 (1934), 46-52.
 — The Supplement at End of 3 Kingdoms 2, *ZAW* 50 (1932), 124-29.
 — and HARRIS, Z. S. : The Ras Shamra Mythological Texts, 1935 [*RSMT*].
- MOORE, G. F. : Judges, *ICC* 1895.
 — Historical Literature, *EB*.
 — Die Eigenart der hebräischen Geschichtsschreibung im alttest. Zeitalter, Lehranstalt f. d. Wissenschaft des Judentums, 28. Bericht, Berlin, 1910, pp. 63 ff.
 — Literature of the O.T., 1913.

- MORET, A. : Histoire de l'Orient, 2 vols., 1936.
- MORGENSTERN, J. : The Three Calendars of Ancient Israel, *HUCA* 1 (1924), 3 ff.; Added Notes, *ib.*, 3 (1928), 77 ff.; Supplementary Studies, etc., *ib.*, 10 (1935), 1 ff.
- Amos Studies, vol. 1, 1941 (collection of articles in *HUCA*, vols. 11, 12-13, 15).
- MORITZ, B. : Die Könige von Edom, *Muséon* 50 (1937), 101-22.
- MOSIMAN, S. K. : Eine Zusammenstellung u. Vergleichung der Paralleltexte der Chronik u. der älteren Bücher des A.T., 1907.
- MOWINCKEL, S. : Psalmen-Studien, 6 vols., 1921-24.
- Die vorderasiatischen Königs- u. Fürsteninschriften (Gunkel-Eucharisterion, 1, 278 ff.), 1923.
- MÜLLER, C., and D. : see *FHG*.
- MÜLLER, W. M. : Asien u. Europa, 1893.
- Egyptological Researches, 3 vols., 1906-20.
- MUSIL, A. : Arabia Petræa, 3 vols., 1907-08.
- Topographical Itineraries, no. 1, The Northern Ḥeḡāz, New York, 1926.
- NAVILLE, E. H. : The Text of the O.T., 1916.
- NESTLE, E. : Bibelübersetzungen, *RPTK*.
- NIELSEN, D., *et al.* : Handbuch der altarabischen Altertumskunde, with chapters by Hommel (History), Rhodokanakis (Polity), Grohmann (Archæology), vol. 1, 1927 [*HAA*].
- NÖLDEKE, T. : Untersuchungen zur Kritik des A.T., 1869.
- Kurzgefasste syrische Grammatik, ed. 2, 1898.
- NOORDTJIJ, A. : 1 and 2 Kroniken, 1937, 1938.
- NORTH, C. R. : The Religious Aspect of Hebrew Kingship, *ZAW* 50 (1932), 8-38.
- The Old Testament Interpretation of History, 1946.
- NOTH, M. : Die israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der gemeinsemitischen Namengebung, *BWANT* III, 10 (1928). (For the earlier literature on the subject see Einl. to the vol.) [*IP*].
- Das System der Zwölfstämme Israels, *BWANT* IV, 1 (1930).
- Das Buch Josua, *HAT* 1938.
- Die Welt des A.T., 1940.
- Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien I. Die sammelnden u. bearbeitenden Geschichtswerke im A.T. (Schriften der Königsberger gelehrten Gesellschaft, 18. Jahr. Geisteswissensch. Klasse, Heft 2), 1943.
- see Kittel, *BH*.
- NOWACK, W. : Lehrbuch der hebräischen Archäologie, 2 vols., 1894.
- OESTERLEY, W. O. E., and ROBINSON, T. H. : Hebrew Religion, Its Origin and Development, 1930; ed. 2, 1937.
- — History of Israel, 2 vols., 1932 (vol. 1 cited as 'Robinson') [*HI*].
- — An Introduction to the Books of the O.T., 1934

- OLMSTEAD, A. T. : Western Asia in the Reign of Sennacherib, Proc. Am. Hist. Assn., 1909, 94 ff.
- Source Study and the Biblical Text, *AJSL* 30 (1913), 1-35.
- The Earliest Book of Kings, *AJSL* 31 (1915), 169-214.
- Assyrian Historiography, Univ. of Missouri Studies, Social Science Series, III, no. 1, 1916.
- History of Assyria, 1923 [*HA*].
- History of Palestine and Syria, 1931 [*HPS*].
- Hebrew History and Historical Method, in G. L. Burr Vol., Persecution and Liberty, 1931, pp. 21 ff.
- OORT, H. : Textus Hebraici emendationes, etc., 1900.
- VON OPPENHEIM, M. : Der Tell Halaf, 1931.
- ORIGEN : E. Klostermann, Erklärung der Samuel- u. Königsbücher, the Gr. text and tr., *GCS*, vol. 6, 1901.
- see Field.
- ORLINSKY, H. M. : Problems of Kethib-Qere, *JAOS* 60 (1940), 30-45.
- On the Present State of Proto-Septuagint Studies, *JAOS* 61 (1941) 81-91.
- OTTO, W. : Handbuch der Archäologie, vol. 1, 1939 [*HA*].
- PATON, L. B. : Baal, Beal, Bel, *ERE*.
- Phœnicians, *ib.*
- PAULY, A. G., and WISSOWA, G. : Real-Encyclopädie (now Real-encyklopädie) der classischen Altertumswissenschaft. Neue Bearbeitung, edd. W. Kroll and K. Mittelhaus (1894 —) [*RE*].
- PEAKE, A. S., ed. : The People and the Book, 1925.
- PEDERSEN, J. : Israel : Its Life and Culture, I-II, 1926 ; III-IV, 1940.
- Die Auffassung vom A.T., *ZAW* 49 (1931), 161-81.
- PEET, T. E. : Egypt and the O.T., 1922.
- A Comparative Study of the Literatures of Egypt, Palestine and Mesopotamia, 1931.
- PERLES, F. : Analekten zur Textkritik des A.T., Neue Folge, 1922.
- PERRON, G., and CHIPIEZ, C. : Histoire de l'art dans l'antiquité, 1882 *seq.*
- PETER MARTYR (PIERRE VERMIGLI) : Malachim, id est, Regum libri duo posteriores cum commentariis, Heidelberg, 1599.
- PETERS, J. P. : The O.T. and the New Scholarship, 1902.
- Early Hebrew Story, 1904.
- PETRIE, W. M. F. : History of Egypt, 6 vols., 1895-1927.
- Ancient Palestine, 1934.
- Palestine and Israel, Historical Notes, 1934.
- PFEIFFER, R. H. : The History, Religion and Literature of Israel. Research in the O.T., 1914-25, *HTR* 27 (1934), 241-325.
- Introduction to the O.T., 1941.
- PIEPENBRING, C. : Histoire du peuple Israël, 1898.
- PIETSCHMANN, R. : Geschichte der Phönizier, 1889.
- PITMAN, J. P. : see Lightfoot.

- VAN DER PLOEG, J. : De Litteratuur van het Oude Testament. Sociale en Economische Vraagstukken uit de Geschiedenis van Israel, Tijd der Koningen (Jaarb. Nr. 7, Ex Oriente Lux [1940], 391-99).
- PLÖGER, O. : Die Prophetengeschichten der Samuel- u. Königsbücher, Greifswald Diss., 1937.
- POGNON, H. : Inscriptions sémitiques de la Syrie, de la Mésopotamie et de la région de Mossoul, 1907-08.
- POOLE (POLUS), M. : Synopsis criticorum aliorumque Sacrae Scripturae interpretum et commentatorum, 5 vols., Frankfurt am Main, 1694.
- PROCOPIUS : Procopii Gazæi in libros Regum et Paralipomenon scholia, ed., I. Meursius, Leiden, 1620.
- PROSDIJ, E. A. : Der sogenannte orientalische Despotismus, P. Koschaker Festschrift, vol. 2 (1939), 235 ff.
- VON RAD, G. : Der Anfang der Geschichtsschreibung im A.T., Archiv f. Kulturgesch., 32 (1944), 1-42.
- RAHLFS, A. : Septuaginta-Studien, Heft 1 (1904), Studien zu den Königsbüchern; Heft 3 (1911), Lucians Rezension der Königsbücher [SS].
- Verzeichnis der griechischen Handschriften des A.T., 1914.
- Septuaginta, 2 vols., 1935.
- see de Lagarde, Theodoret.
- RANKE, H. : see Erman, Gressmann.
- VON RANKE, L. : Weltgeschichte, 1881-88.
- 'RASHI' (R. SHELOMO B. ISAAC—also 'YARCHI') : cited from Mikra'oth Gedoloth, and J. F. Breithaupt's tr., R. Salomonis Jarchi commentarius Hebraicus, etc., 2 vols., Gotha, 1713-14.
- RAWLINSON, G. : The Five Great Monarchies of the Ancient Eastern World, ed. 2, 3 vols., 1871.
- Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie u. Kirche, ed. 3, edd. J. J. Herzog, A. Hauck, 1896-1913 [RPTK].
- Reallexicon der Assyriologie, edd. E. Ebeling and B. Meissner, vols. 1, 2, 1932-38 [RA].
- Reallexicon der Vorgeschichte, ed. M. Ebert, 1924-32 [RVg.].
- Record and Revelation, Essays on the O.T., ed. H. W. Robinson, contributors Eissfeldt, Elmslie, Hempel, Hooke, Lods, Lofthouse, Montefiore, Montgomery, Oesterley, Porteous, Robinson, Rowley, Snaith, Wardle, 1938.
- REHM, M. : Textkritische Untersuchungen zu den Parallelstellen der Samuel-Königsbücher u. der Chronik, 1937.
- REISNER, G. A. : see Lyon.
- Religion in Geschichte u. Gegenwart, edd. H. Gunkel and L. Zscharnack, ed. 2, 1927-31 (5 vols., + Registerband) [RGG].
- RENAN, E. : Mission en Phénicie, 1864.
- REUSS, E. : Das Alte Testament, 1892.
- RHODOKANAKIS, N. : Studien zur Lexicographie u. Grammatik des Altsüdarabischen, Sb., Vienna Academy, 1915, 1917, 1931.
- see Gressmann, ATB.
- see Nielsen, HAA.

- RICCIOTTI, G. : Histoire d'Israël, vol. I, Des origines à l'Exil, French tr., 1939.
- ROBINSON, E., and SMITH, E. : Biblical Researches in Palestine, Mount Sinai and Arabia Petraea . . . in the Year 1838, 3 vols., 1841 [BR].
 — Later Biblical Researches in Palestine and in the Adjacent Regions . . . in the Year 1852, 1856 [LBR].
- ROBINSON, G. L. : Sarcophagus of an Ancient Civilization, 1930.
- ROBINSON, H. W. : The History of Israel : Its Facts and Factors, 1938.
- ROBINSON, T. H. : Decline and Fall of the Hebrew Kingdoms, 1926.
- HUNKIN, J. W., and BURKITT, F. C. : Palestine in General History, 1929.
- ROBINSON, T. H. : Some Economic and Social Factors in the History of Israel, Exp. Times, 45 (1934), 264-9, 294-300.
 — see Oesterley and Robinson.
- ROGERS, R. W. : Cuneiform Parallels to the O.T., 1912 [CP].
 — History of Babylonia and Assyria, ed. 6, 2 vols., 1915 [HBA].
- ROSENTHAL, F. : Die aramaistische Forschung seit Th. Nöldeke's Veröffentlichungen, 1939.
- DE ROSSI, J. B. : Variæ lectiones Veteris Testamenti, 4 vols., Parma, 1784-88.
 — Scholia critica in V.T. libros, seu supplementa, etc., Parma, 1798.
- ROST, L. : Weidewechsel u. altisraelitischer Festkalender, ZDPV 66 (1943), 205-16.
- ROSTOVITZEF, M. I. : A History of the Ancient World, 2 vols., 1926-30
 — see Baur.
- ROTHSTEIN, J. W., and HÄNEL, J. : Komm. zum ersten Buch der Chronik, *KmAT*, 2 vols., 1927.
- RYCKMANS, G. : Les noms propres sud-sémitiques, 3 vols., Louvain, 1934-35 [NPS].
- RYLE, H. E. : The Canon of the O.T., ed. 2, 1904.
- SABATIER, P. : Bibliorum Sacrorum Latinæ versiones antiquæ seu vetus Italica, 3 vols., 1751.
- SACHAU, E. : Aramäische Papyrus u. Ostraka aus einer jüdischen Militär-Kolonie zu Elephantine, 1911 [APO].
 — see Ausgrabungen in Sendschirli.
- ŠANDA, A. : Untersuchungen zur Kunde des alten Orients, *MVG* 1902, part 2.
 — Die Bücher der Könige, 2 vols., 1911-12.
- SCHIFFER, S. : Die Aramäer, 1911.
- SCHLATTER, A. : Zur Topographie u. Geschichte Palästinas, 1893.
- SCHLEUSNER, J. F. : Novus thesaurus philologico-criticus sive lexicon in LXX, etc., 5 vols., 1820-21.
- SCHLÖGL, N. : Die Bücher der Könige u. die Bücher der Chronik, 1911.
- SCHMIDT, H. : Die Geschichtsschreibung im A.T., 1911.
- SCHNABEL, P. : see Berossos.

- SCHOENE, A. : see Eusebius.
- SCHOFF, W. H. : The Periplus of the Erythræan Sea, 1912.
- SCHOFIELD, J. N. : The Historical Background of the Bible, 1938.
- SCHRADER, E. : Keilinschriften u. Geschichtsforschung, 1878.
- Die Keilinschriften u. das A.T., ed. 2, 1883=Eng. tr. by O. C. Whitehouse, Cuneiform Inscriptions and the O.T., 2 vols., 1885-88 [CIOT].
- ed. 3, edd. H. Zimmern and H. Winckler, 1902 [KAT].
- Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek, 6 vols., 1889-1915 [KB].
- SCHÜRER, E. : Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes, 3 vols., ed. 4, 1901-09 [GJV].
- SCHWALLY, F. : see Stade, SBOT.
- SEELIGMANN, J. : Problemen en Perspectieven in het Moderne Septuaginta-Onderzoek (Jaarb. Nr. 7, Ex Oriente Lux [1940], 359-390e).
- SELDEN, J. : De dis Syris syntagmata, ed. 2, with Additamenta by M. A. Beyer, Leipzig, 1672.
- SELLIN, E. : Tell Ta'annek, 1904.
- Geschichte des israel.-jüdischen Volkes, 2 parts., 1924-32.
- Einleitung in das A.T., ed. 7, 1935. Eng. tr. by W. Montgomery Introduction to the O.T., 1923.
- SHOTWELL, J. T. : Introduction to the History of History, 1922.
- revised ed. of above, The History of History, vol. 1, 1939.
- SIMONS, J. : Handbook for the Study of Egyptian Topographical Lists relating to Western Asia, Leiden, 1937.
- SIMPSON, D. C. : ed., O.T. Essays, 1927.
- SINGER, C. : see Bevan.
- SKINNER, J. : Genesis, ICC 1910.
- Kings (Century Bible), n.d. (ca. 1893).
- SKOSS, S. L. : see al-Fāsi.
- SLOET, D. A. W. H. : Kings, Third and Fourth Book of, *Catholic Encyclopedia*, 1910.
- SLOUSCH, N. : Representative Government among the Hebrews and Phœnicians, *JQR*, N.S., 4 (1913-14), 303-10.
- SMEND, R. : Lehrbuch der alttest. Religionsgeschichte, ed. 2, 1899.
- SMITH, G. A. : The Historical Geography of the Holy Land, ed. 25, London, 1931 [HG].
- Jerusalem, 2 vols., 1908.
- SMITH, H. P. : Samuel, ICC 1899.
- SMITH, SIDNEY : Babylonian Historical Texts, 1924.
- see CAH.
- SMITH, W. R. : The Prophets of Israel, 1882.
- Lectures on the Religion of the Semites, 1889; ed. 3, 1927.
- The O.T. in the Jewish Church, ed. 2, 1892.
- Kings, *Enc. Br.*⁹.
- and KAUTZSCH, E. : Kings, EB.
- SOPHOCLES, E. P. : Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods, 1870.

- SPERBER, A. : Hebrew based upon Greek and Latin Transliterations. *HUCA* 12-13 (1938), 103 ff.
- Hebrew based upon Biblical Passages in Parallel Transmission, *ib.*, 14 (1939), 153 ff.
- STADE, B. : Lehrbuch der hebräischen Grammatik, 1879.
- Der Text des Berichtes über Salomos Bauten, 1 Kö. 5-7 (with bibliog.), *ZAW* 3 (1883), 129-77; Anmerkungen zu 2 Kö. 10-14, *ib.*, 5 (1885), 275-97; Anmerkungen zu 2 Kö. 15-21, *ib.*, 6 (1886), 156-89; these articles collected in his *Ausgewählte akademische Reden*, 1899, from which citation below is made.
- Geschichte des Volkes Israel, 2 vols., 1887-88 [*GVI*].
- and SCHWALLY, F., with Notes by P. HAUPT: The Book of Kings, Critical Edition . . . Printed in Colours, etc., 1904, in Haupt's series, The Sacred Books of the O.T. [*SBOT*].
- STUEERNAGEL, C. : Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das A.T., 1912.
- STRACK, H. : Einleitung in das A.T., ed. 4, 1895, ed. 6, 1906.
- STRECK, M. : Älteste Geschichte der Aramäer, *Klio*, vi, 2 (1906), 193 ff.
- STRONG, H. A. : see Lucian.
- SULZBERGER, M. : The Am Ha-Aretz: the Ancient Hebrew Parliament, 1909, reprint 1910.
- SWETE, H. B. : The O.T. in Greek, 3 vols., 1909-22.
- An Introduction to the O.T. in Greek, 1914.
- TAYLOR, C. : see Burkitt.
- Texte u. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der alttestamentlichen Literatur, 2nd series, 1897 seq. [*TU*].
- Texts and Studies, Cambridge, 1891 seq. [*TS*].
- THACKERAY, H. St. J. : The Septuagint and Jewish Worship, 1921.
- Josephus, the Man and the Historian, 1929.
- see Brooke, Josephus.
- THAYER, J. B. : A Greek-English Lexicon of the N.T., 1887.
- THENIUS, O. : Die Bücher der Könige, ed. 2, 1873; ed. 3, ed. M. Löhr, 1898.
- THEODORET : Theodoret's Zitate aus den Königsbüchern u. dem 2. Buche der Chronik, *SS* 1, 16-46.
- THOMPSON, J. E. H. : The Samaritans, 1919.
- THOMPSON, R. C. : see *CAH*.
- THOMSEN, P. : Kompendium der palästinischen Altertumskunde, 1913.
- Palästina u. seine Kultur, ed. 3, 1931.
- Die Palästina-Literatur, 5 vols., 1895-1938.
- TISCHENDORF, C. : see Heyse.
- TODD, J. C. : Politics and Religion in Ancient Israel, 1904.
- TORCZYNER, H., collaborators L. HARDING, A. LEWIS, and J. L. STARKEY : Lachish I, The Lachish Letters, 1937 [*LL*].
- The Lachish Ostraca (in Hebrew with Hebrew title, with additional ostraca), Jerusalem, 1940.

- TORREY, C. C. : New Notes on Old Inscriptions, *ZA* 26 (1912), 77-92.
 — Pseudo-Ezekiel and the Original Prophecy, 1930.
- TOYNBEE, A. J. : A Study of History, 6 vols., 1934-39.
- TOZER, H. F. : History of Ancient Geography, ed. 2, 1935.
- TUFNELL, O. : see Lachish II.
- UNGNAD, A. : Die Zahl der von Sanherib deportierten Judäer., *ZAW* 59 (1943), 199-202.
- VANUTELLI, P. : Libri synoptici Veteris Testamenti seu librorum Regum et Chronicorum loci paralleli, 2 vols., Rome, 1931-34.
- VATKE, W. : Historisch-kritische Einleitung in das A.T., 1886.
- VIGOUROUX, F. : Dictionnaire de la Bible, 5 vols., 1895-1912 ; Supplement, vols. 1-3, 1928-38 (unfinished) [*DB*].
- VINCENT, H. : Jérusalem, vol. 1, Jér. Antique, 1912, vol. 2, Jér. Nouvelle, 1926.
 — La religion des judéo-araméens d'Éléphantiné, 1937.
- VOLCK, W. : Könige, *RPTK*.
- VOLZ, P. : Der Geist Gottes u. die verwandten Erscheinungen im A.T. u. im anschliessenden Judentum, 1910.
 — Die biblischen Altertümer, ed. 2, 1923.
- WAHRMUND, A. : Hwb. der arabischen u. deutschen Sprache, ed. 3, 1897-98.
- WALTON, BRIAN : Biblia Polyglotta, 6 vols., London, 1657 (see his introductory studies, 1, 1-122) [*LP*].
 — Biblicus apparatus chronologico-topographico-philosophicus, Zürich, 1672.
- WARDLE, W. L. : The History and Religion of Israel, 1936.
- WATZINGER, C. : Denkmäler Palästinas, 2 vols., 1933-35 [*DP*].
- WEBER, O. : Die Literatur der Babylonier u. Assyrer, 1907.
- WEIDNER, E. E. : Die Könige von Assyrien, *MVAG*, 1921.
- WEILL, R. : La cité de David : compte rendu . . . campagne de 1913-14, with atlas of plates, 1920.
- WEISER, A. : Glaube u. Geschichte im A.T., *BHANT* IV, 4 (1931).
 — Die theologische Aufgabe der alttestamentlichen Wissenschaft, in Werden und Wesen des A.T., *BZAW* 66 (1936), 207-24.
 — Einleitung in das A.T., 1939.
- WELCH, A. C. : The Work of the Chronicler, 1939.
- WELLHAUSEN, J. : Israel, *Enc. Br.*⁹.
 — Skizzen u. Vorarbeiten, 6 vols., 1884-99 ; vol. 1, Abriss der Geschichte Israels u. Judas, vol. 3, Reste arabischen Heidentums.
 — Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels, ed. 3, 1886 (ed. 6, 1905) [*Proleg.*].
 — Die Composition des Hexateuchs u. der historischen Bücher des A.T., ed. 3, 1899 ; pp. 263-301 on Kings=Bleek, Einl.⁴, 231-67 [*Comp.*].
 — Israelitische u. jüdische Geschichte, ed. 4, 1901 (also edd. 1904, 1914) [*Gesch.*].

- WEVERS, J. W. : Double Readings in the Books of Kings, *JBL* 65 (1946), 307-10.
- WIENER, H. M. : The Composition of Judges II. 11 to 1 Kings II. 46, Leipzig, 1929.
- The Altars of the O.T., *Olz.*, Beigabe, 1927.
- Posthumous Essays, 1932.
- WINCKLER, H. : Untersuchungen zu altorientalischer Geschichte, 1889.
- Beiträge zur Quellenscheidung der Königsbücher, in *Alttestamentliche Untersuchungen*, 1892, pp. 1-54.
- Keilinschriftliches Textbuch zum A.T., 1892; ed. 3, 1909 [*KAT*].
- Altorientalische Forschungen, 1893-1906.
- Geschichte Israels in Einzeldarstellungen, 1895-1900 [*GI*].
- see Schrader, *KAT*.
- WRIGHT, G. E., and FILSON, F. V. : The Westminster Historical Atlas to the Bible, 1945.
- WRIGHT, T. : Early Travels in Palestine, 1848.
- WRIGHT, W. : A Grammar of the Arabic Language, ed. 3, edd. W. R. Smith and M. J. de Goeje, 2 vols., 1933.
- WÜRTHWEIN, S. E. : Der 'amm ha'arez im A.T., *BWANT* IV, 17 (1936).
- WUTZ, F. : see Eusebius Pamphili.
- ZIMMERMANN, F. : The Perpetuation of Variants in the Masoretic Text, *JQR* 34 (1944), 459-74.
- ZIMMERN, H. : see Schrader, *KAT*.
- ZORELL, P. : *Lexicon Hebraicum et Aramaicum V.T.*, Rome, 1940 —.
- ZSCHERNACK, L. : see Religion in Geschichte u. Gegenwart.

MODERN BIBLE TRANSLATIONS

ENGLISH

King James Bible (' Authorized Version '), 1611, current text [AV].
Revised Version, 1885 [RV].

American Revised Version (' Standard Version '), 1901 [RV^{Am}].

The Holy Scriptures, Jewish Publ. Soc. of America, 1917 [JV].

The Holy Bible . . . a New Translation, by James Moffatt, New York,
1922 [Moff.].

The Bible, an American Translation, O.T. ed. J. M. P. Smith Ki.
tr. by L. Waterman ; Chicago, 1931 [Chic. B.].

FRENCH

Ed. by J. E. Ostervald, ed. 3, Bienne and Neuchatel, 1771 [FV].

GERMAN

Luther's tr., current text [GV].

LATIN

O.T. by E. Tremellius and F. Junius, N.T. by T. Beza, Zürich, 1673.

In this book the chapter divisions and verse-numberings are those of JV, which follows the system of all Hebrew prints. The variations of numbering are given in the margin of the RVV.

CHRONOLOGY

See Int., §16.

CARTOGRAPHY

In addition to the Palestine Exploration Fund Map of Western Palestine (1882), and the PEF Map of Palestine (1898), the Department of Lands and Surveys of Palestine has now published 14 sheets of Palestine, west of the Jordan, stretching northward from Beersheba to the Syrian frontier. The Palestine Survey has published a convenient folding pocket map, *Palestine of the O.T.* (print of 1938). In addition are to be noted the maps in G. A. Smith, *HG*, and his *Historical Atlas of the Holy Land* (ed. 2, 1936), and the rich collection in Abel, *GP*; cf. also the 'Map of the Principal Excavated Sites of Palestine,' *PEQ* 1932, opp. 220. For Syria there are the detailed maps in Dussaud, *TH*. *N.b.* the very useful 'Baedekers' for these lands. For the Bible Lands at large are to be noted Guthe's *Bibelatlas*, ed. 2, Leipzig, 1926, the map in the *National Geographic Magazine*, Dec. 1938, the Maps of Bible Lands published by the American Bible Society for inclusion in its edition of the Bible, edited by J. O. Boyd and W. F. Albright, 1939, and the maps in *The Westminster Historical Atlas to the Bible*, edited by G. E. Wright and F. V. Filson, Philadelphia, 1945.

INSCRIPTIONS, EPIGRAPHS, ETC., COMMONLY CITED

PALESTINE

The Moabite Stone (Mesha stele) : see Comm., II. 3^{4a}, n. 1.

The Siloam inscription : see Comm., II. 20²⁰.

The tablet material : see Diringer, *IAE*, Torczyner's volumes.

PHENICIA

Byblos

Ahiram inscr. : Dussaud, Syria, 1924, 135 ff. ; Torrey, *JAOS* 46 (1926), 237 ff.

Yehaumilk : *CIS* I, no. 1 ; *HNE* 416 ; *NSI* no. 3 ; *AT* no. 5.

Sidon

Tabnith inscr. : *HNE* 417 ; *NSI* no. 4 ; *AT* no. 6.

Eshmunazar inscr. : *CIS* I, no. 3 ; *HNE* 417 ; *NSI* no. 5 ; *AT* no. 7.

SYRIA

Āfiş (near Aleppo)

Zakar inscr. : Pogonon, *Inscr. sém.*, no. 86 ; *Eph.*, 3, 1 ff. ; *CAH* 3, 375 ; *ATB* 1, 443.

Senjirli

The Hadad, Panammuwa, Bar-Rkb inscriptions : *Ausgrabungen in Sendschirli*, vol. 1, parts 3, 4 ; *HNE* 440 ff. ; *NSI* nos. 61-63.

Kilammuwa inscr. : *Ausgrabungen in Sendschirli*, vol. 4, 374 ; E. Littmann, *Sb.*, Berlin Academy, 45 (1911), 976 ; *Eph.*, 3, 218 ; Torrey, *JAOS* 1935, 364.

Sūjīn (Sefireh) : see Comm., I. 18, n. 1.

Ugarit (Ras Shamra) : the texts published by C. Virolleaud, in *Syria*, 1929 seq., and subsequent vols., *Danel, Keret*, 1936 and in *Rev. d'Ass.*, 1940-41. Compendia with introductions, glossaries, etc. : Montgomery and Harris, *RSMT* 1935 ; H. L. Ginsberg, *The Ugarit Texts* (in Hebrew), Jerusalem, 1936 ; H. Bauer, *Die alphabetischen Keilschrifttexte von Ras Shamra*, 1936 ; D. Nielsen, *Ras Šamra Mythologie u. biblische Theologie*, Abh. xxi, 4 (1936) of the Deutsche Morgenl. Gesellschaft ; C. F. A. Schaeffer, *The Cuneiform Texts of Ras Shamra-Ugarit*, Schweich Lectures (1939), and *Ugaritica* (Paris, 1939), a full bibliography ; C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Grammar*, Rome, 1940. In the meanwhile Prof. Gordon has published a more extensive work, *Ugaritic Handbook* : I. Revised Grammar, Paradigms ; II. Texts in Transliteration ; III. Comprehensive Glossary, Rome, 1947.

xlii INSCRIPTIONS, EPIGRAPHS, ETC., COMMONLY CITED

AKKADIAN TEXTS

Amarna tablets: J. A. Knudtzon, *Die el-Amarna Tafeln*, 1915;
S. A. B. Mercer, *The Tell el-Amarna Tablets*, 2 vols., 1939.

Assyrian Eponym List: *KB* 1, 204; *CP* 219; *ARA* 2, 427; Olm-
stead, 'The Ass. Chronicle,' *AJSL* 34, 344.

Babylonian Chronicles: see Int., §16, n. 3.

Babylonian King Lists: *KB* 1, 286; *CP* 201.

Synchronistic History (early Babylonian-Assyrian): *KB* 1, 194.

PTOLEMAIC CANON

KB 2, 290; *CP* 239.

KEY TO ABBREVIATIONS

Omitted are abbreviations for Biblical books, grammatical and commonplace abbreviations.

AASOR : Annual of American Schools of Oriental Research.
AB : see Barton.
Abh. : Abhandlung(en).
Acta Or. : Acta Orientalia.
Afo : Archiv für Orientforschung.
AfR : Archiv für Religionswissenschaft.
AHNE : see R. H. Hall.
AHR : American Historical Review.
AJA : American Journal of Archæology.
AJSL : American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures.
AJT : American Journal of Theology.
AKAT : see Jirku.
 Akk. : Akkadian.
 Albr. : Albright.
Ant. : Josephus, Antiquities.
AO : der alte Orient.
 Aq. : Aquila.
ARA : see Luckenbill.
 Arab. : Arabic.
 Aram. : Aramaic.
Arch. : Archæology.
Arch. Or. : Archiv Orientalní.
ARE : see Breasted.
 Arm. : Armenian.
 art(s.) : article(s).
ARw : Archiv für Religionswissenschaft.
 Ass. : Assyrian.
 ast. : asterisk (Eusebian).
AT : see Lidzbarski
 A.T. : Altes Testament.
ATB : see Gressmann.

ATLAO : see Jeremias.
ATR : Anglican Theological Review.
AV : Authorized Version.

 Bab. : Babylonian.
BA : Biblical Archæologist.
BASOR : Bulletin of American Schools of Oriental Research.
BDB : see Brown-Driver-Briggs.
BDD : Bible Dictionaries.
 Benz. : Benzinger.
 Bergstr. : Bergsträsser.
BH : Kittel, *BH*³.
BJ : Josephus, Bellum Judaicum.
BL : see Bauer-Leander.
BL : Biblisches Lexicon.
BR : see Galling.
 Brock. : Brockelmann.
 Burn. : Burney.
BWA(N)T : Beiträge zur Wissenschaft vom A.(u. N.)T.
BZAW : Beihefte to *ZAW*.

CAH : Cambridge Ancient History.
C.Ap. : Josephus, Contra Apionem.
 Chic. B. : Chicago Bible.
 Chr.-Pal. : Christian-Palestinian (dialect).
CIOT : see Schrader.
CIS : Corpus inscriptionum Semiticarum.
 Comm. : main text of this Commentary.
 comm. : commentaor(s), commentary, -ies.
CP : see Rogers.

CR : Comptes Rendus, Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, Paris.

CSCO : Corpus script. Christ. Orient.

CSEG : Corpus script. eccles. Græc.

CSEL : Corpus script. eccles. Lat.

CT : Cuneiform Texts . . . British Museum (1896 seq.).

DB : Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible.

DCB : Dictionary of Christian Biography.

deR. : de Rossi.

dittog. : dittograph(y).

Dr. : S. R. Driver.

DZG : Deutsche Zeitschrift für Geschichtsforschung.

EB : Encyclopædia Biblica.

ed., edd. : editor(s), edition(s).

Ehrl. : Ehrlich.

Eissf. : Eissfeldt.

Enc. Br. : Encyclopædia Britannica.

Eph. : see Lidzbarski.

ERE : Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics.

Eth. : Ethiopic.

Eus. : Eusebius.

EVV : English Versions, AV, RVV.

Ew. : Ewald.

FHG : Fragmenta historicorum Græcorum.

FuF : Forschungen u. Fortschritte.

FV : French Version.

GB : see Gesenius-Buhl.

GCS : Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte.

Ges. : Gesenius.

Ginsb. : Ginsburg.

GK : see Gesenius-Kautzsch.

Gr., *Grr.* : Greek, Greek texts.

Gr. : Grammar, Grammatik.

Gressm. : Gressmann.

GV : German Version.

HA : Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft.

HAA : see Nielsen.

haplog. : haplograph(y).

HAT : Handbuch zum A.T., ed. Eissfeldt.

Heb. : Hebrew.

Her. : Herodotus.

Hex. : Hexapla, Hexaplaric.

HkAT : Handkommentar zum A.T., ed. W. Nowack.

homoiotel. : homoioteleuton.

HNE : see Lidzbarski.

HP : see Holmes-Parsons.

HSAT : see Kautzsch.

HTR : Harvard Theological Review.

HTS : Harvard Theological Studies.

HUCA : Hebrew Union College Annual.

Hwb. : Handwörterbuch.

IAE : see Diringer.

ICC : International Critical Commentary.

ILN : Illustrated London News.

JAOS : Journal of the American Oriental Society.

JBL : Journal of Biblical Literature.

JDT : Jahrbuch für deutsche Theologie.

JE : Jewish Encyclopædia.

JNES : Journal of Near Eastern Studies (continuation of *AJSL*).

Jos. : Josephus.

JPOS : Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society.

JPT : Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie.

JQR : Jewish Quarterly Review.

JR : Journal of Religion.

- JSOR* : Journal of the Society for Oriental Research.
JTS : Journal of Theological Studies.
JV : Jewish Version.
 Kamph : Kamphausen.
KAT, KB : see Schrader.
 Ken. : Kennicott.
 Ki. : Kings.
 Kit. : Kittel.
 Klost. : Klostermann.
KmAT : Kommentar zum A.T., ed. E. Sellin.
 Kr. : Krê.
 Kt. : Kethib.
 Lat. : Latin.
LCS : Die lateinischen christlichen Schriftsteller der drei ersten Jahrhunderte.
Lex(x) : Lexicon, -a.
LHeb. : Late Hebrew.
Lidzb. : Lidzbarski.
LP : Walton's London Polyglot.
Luc. : Lucian.
Lucif. : Lucifer of Calaris.
 Mas. : Masora, -etic.
 Meinh. : Meinhold.
Mél. : Mélanges de la Faculté Orientale, Université Saint Joseph, Beyrouth.
MGWJ : Monatschrift für Geschichte u. Wissenschaft des Judentums.
Mich. : Michaelis's Hebrew text.
 minusc. : minuscule(s).
MNDPV : Mittheilungen u. Nachrichten des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins.
 Moff. : Moffatt's Bible.
 Montg. : Montgomery.
 MS., MSS. : manuscript(s).
MVÄG : Mittheilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Ägyptischen Gesellschaft (continuing *MVG*).
MVG : Mittheilungen der Vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft.
 Nab. : Nabataean.
NHeb. : New (post-Biblical) Hebrew.
Nöld. : Nöldeke.
NPS : see Ryckmans.
NSI : see Cooke.
N.T. : New Testament, Neues Testament.
 OArab. : Old Arabic.
 OAram. : Old Aramaic.
 obel. : obelisk (Eusebian).
Oc. : Occidental tradition of the Hebrew text.
OGr. : the 'Septuagintal' text.
OGr. : the above and the Lucianic text.
OLat. : Old Latin.
OLz. : Orientalistische Literaturzeitung.
Onom. Gr./Lat. : Onomasticon Græcum/Latinum; see Eusebius.
Or. : Oriental tradition of the Hebrew text.
Or. Inst. Publ. : Oriental Institute Publications, University of Chicago.
O.T. : Old Testament.
OTG : see Brooke.
 Palm. : Palmyrene.
PEF : Palestine Exploration Fund.
PEQ : Palestine Exploration Quarterly (continuing *QS* since 1936).
PG : Migne, Patrologia Græca.
 Phœn. : Phœnician.
Pjb. : Palästinajahrbuch.
PL : Migne, Patrologia Latina.
PSBA : Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archæology.
QS : Quarterly Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund.
RA : Reallexicon der Assyriologie.

- RB* : Revue Biblique.
rdg(s) : reading(s).
RE : see Pauly-Wissowa.
reff. : references.
REJ : Revue des Études Juifs.
resp. : respectively.
Rev. d'Ass. : Revue d'Assyriologie.
RGG : Religion in Geschichte u. Gegenwart, ed. 2.
RHR : Revue de l'Histoire des Religions.
RPTK : Realencyklopädie für Protestantische Theologie u. Kirche.
RS : Revue Sémitique.
RSMT : see Montgomery and Harris.
RV : British Revised Version of English Bible ; *RV^{AM}* the American Revision ; *RVV* these and *JV* together, unless exception is made.
RVg. : Reallexicon der Vorgesichte.

S. Arab. : South Arabic.
SAT : Die Schriften des A.T. in Auswahl (1921-25).
Sb. : Sitzungsberichte, Philos.-hist. Klasse, of the Academy named.
SBOT : see Stade.
Sk. : Skinner.
SOT : see Kent.
SS : Septuaginta-Studien, A. Rahlfs.
St. : Stade.
sugg. : suggest(s).
- suppl.* : supply, -ies.
supplem. : supplement.
Sym. : Symmachus.
Syr. : Syriac.

Targ. : Targum.
Then. : Thenius.
Theod. : Theodotion.
Th. R. : Theologische Rundschau.
Tisch. : Tischendorf's ed. of Vulgate.
tr., trr. : translator(s), translation(s).
TS : Texts and Studies.
TSK : Theologische Studien und Kritiken.
TU : Texte u. Untersuchungen.

var(r) : variant(s).
vs. : *versus*.
VS, VSS : Version(s), ancient.
V.T. : Vetus Testamentum.

Watz. : Watzinger.
Wb. : Wörterbuch.
WDB : Westminster Dictionary of the Bible.
Wellh. : Wellhausen.

ZA : Zts. für Assyriologie.
ZAW : Zts. für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.
ZDMG : Zts. der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft.
ZDPV : Zts. des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins.
ZfS : Zts. für Semitik.
Zts. : Zeitschrift.
ZWT : Zts. für wissenschaftliche Theologie.

SYMBOLS IN CRITICAL APPARATUS

Ⲁ : Arabic VS.	Ⲑ : Masoretic apparatus of \mathfrak{H} ;
Ⲃ : Coptic VS.	Ⲑ ^{oc} , Ⲑ ^{or} , the Occidental, Oriental forms respectively.
Ⲅ : Ethiopic VS.	ⲑ : Palestinian Aramaic.
Ⲇ : Old Greek (' Septuagint ').	ⲓ : Syriac VS (Peshitta).
Ⲇ ^L : the Lucianic Greek.	ⲓ ^H : the Syro-Hexapla.
Ⲇ ^H : the Hexaplaric Greek.	Ⲕ : Targum ; Ⲕ ^L , de Lagarde's ed. ; Ⲕ ^w , Walton's ed.
Ⲉ : the Hebrew text.	ⲕ : Vulgate.
Ⲋ : Old Latin texts.	

The following symbols are also used :

- † indicates that all the cases in the Hebrew Bible are cited.
- + a critical plus.
- || parallelism.
- > etymological process toward.
- < etymological process from.
- [] in the translation has bearing on the text of \mathfrak{H} ; () expresses an interpretative addition.
- ⌘ as asterized plus in the Hexapla.
- ÷ an obelized minus in the Hexapla.

INTRODUCTION

I. THE BOOK

§I. PLACE IN THE CANON AS A DISTINCT BOOK; CONTENTS

Kings is one of 'the Twenty-Four Books,' constituting the sacred canon of the Jews, and the fourth book of the Former Prophets.¹ It is a continuation of the book of Samuel, but without clearly marked literary distinction. For the mechanical history of Sam.-Ki. must be postulated a series of rolls, which were divided for arbitrary convenience. In the Hebrew division Sam. and Ki. are of almost equal length, in Bär's edition of respectively 91 and 93 pages. The Greek scribes with their smaller quires went further, and equally for convenience produced four volumes with the title, *αἱ βασιλείαι*, generally translated, 'The Kingdoms,' but Thackeray has observed (p. 263) that, following Hellenistic use, the Greek should be translated 'The Reigns.' There is variation as to the joint between Sam. and Ki. in the Greek texts, although there the major tradition followed the distinction of the Hebrew Bible. However, Lucian found another division, after I. 2¹¹, with the actual termination of David's reign, which for historiography might be preferred. And Josephus begins bk. viii of his *Antiquities* at this point. But there is evidence for yet another division in the early Greek; after I. 2^{46a} some supplementary material is collected, evidently assembled there at the end of a tome (*v. ad loc.*). Indeed, after Hebrew syntax, a fresh section begins with the ensuing clause, "the kingdom being established in Solomon's hand." Cf. also remarks below on the literary 'break' in the Greek in 4^{20ff.}²

¹ According to the Talmud, *Baba Bathra*, 15a, Jeremiah was the author of 'his own book and the book of Kings and Lamentations.'

² Thackeray in his 'Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings' and in his *Septuagint and Jewish Worship* contends stoutly for Lucian's division between 2 and 3 Kgdms as original, also basing his argument

The Greek collocation of Sam.-Ki. as one book with its division into four volumes was followed by all the ancient Versions. The Greek title as of 'The Kingdoms' appeared in early titles of the Latin Bible; the Arabic as well as the Ethiopic followed the Hebrew with 'Kings'; the Syriac used both titles, varying with the books. In the Latin Bible 'Kings' came into current use; but this version preserved also a second titulation for 1 and 2 Ki. as 'secundum Hebræos primus/secundus Malachim,' *i.e.*, with transliteration of the Hebrew title.³ With the revival of learning in the Western Church and the direct translations from the Hebrew the distinction between Sam. and Ki. was established, with, however, the continuance of the Greek division of each book into two halves. This distinction has been accepted in all Christian prints of the Bible, except in Ginsburg's and Kittel's editions, as it is also noted marginally in Jewish prints, *e.g.*, in the encyclopædic Miḳra'oth Gedoloth. For this division see Burney on II. 1¹.

The book continues that of Samuel with the history of the regency and reign of Solomon, records the disruption of North and South under his son, pursues in artfully articulated fashion the parallel histories of the two kingdoms, with a rich treasury of historical stories from the North, and finally centres on the surviving kingdom of the South, until at last, with the original conclusion of the book (II. 25^{21b}), "Judah went into exile away from its land." One recalls Polybius's drama of the end of Greece before Rome, and, closer to the theme, Josephus's *Antiquities* of his people, after their second ruin as a nation. But this work, compilation as it is of many and various sources, precedes those others in antiquity and with a faith they did not possess. For the editors, that history was worthy of record because it was guided by the hand of God, contradicted as he was by his own people. There was latent the belief that his on the almost exact equality of the parts of Codex B for 1 Kgdms and 2 Kgdms—3 Kgdms 2¹¹. But Rahlfs takes positive position against Thackeray (*SS* 3, 186 ff.). In any case such divisions were primarily practical. *Cf.* the awkward opening of 2 Ki. with the fragmentary item, "And Moab rebelled against Israel after the death of Ahab."

³ *Cf.* Jerome's observation in his Prologus Galeatus (Tischendorf's ed. of the Vulgate, p. xxvii): "Melius multo est Malachim, id est, Regum, quam Mamlachot, id est, Regnorum, dicere."

purpose would continue for the future, and such a postscript of hope was early added to the book, after II. 25²⁶.¹

§2. TEXT AND LANGUAGE

The basic text here used is that of the third edition of Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica* (*BH*), the editorship of which was notably continued after that distinguished scholar's death in 1929, appearing in parts, 1929-37 (see Bibliography). Its unique merit lies in the reproduction of a single manuscript, and that the oldest accessible one, the manuscript in the Public Library of Leningrad (MS L). This is a pure representative of the family of Ben Asher, as distinguished from the hitherto printed texts which contain traditions of Ben Naphtali; these texts follow Jacob Chayyim's Bomberg Bible of 1524-25, itself repeated by Kittel in the earlier editions.¹

As against the common tacit assumption of a fixed *textus receptus* of the Hebrew Bible the Notes in this Commentary cite constantly by way of example the various readings of the editions of Michaelis, Kennicott (his upper text), Bär, and the two of Ginsburg. For the thesaurus of variant texts recourse must still be taken primarily to Kennicott's *V.T. Hebraicum*, and to the invaluable critical digest of the material, along with collation of a large number of MSS of his own collation, by de Rossi (Kennicott's warm friend) in his *Variæ Lectiones*, and the important supplementary volume of incidental materials, *Scholia critica*.² His work is invaluable

¹ The Old Greek gives additional material (*e.g.*, the long story attached to I. 12), varying dispositions of the materials (*e.g.*, the two long supplements in I. 2), rearrangements (as in I. 5-7, and the exchange of cc. 20 and 21), as well as also innumerable variations in text. The pertinent problems will be considered *ad locos*.

² See the 'Prolegomena' of Kittel and collaborators and successors prefacing the completed volume. For further recent treatments of the learned apparatus, reference may be made to the writer's *Daniel*, *Int.*, §§5, 6; *Eissf., Einl.*, §§100, 101; Kahle, 'Der alttest. Bibeltext,' *Th. R.*, 1933, 227 ff.; and the admirable digest in Pfeiffer, *Int.*, pp. 71-104.

³ Kennicott gives a descriptive and critical 'Catalogus Codicum' in the 'Dissertatio Generalis' at end of vol. 2. De Rossi in the 'Prolegomenon' to vol. 1 repeats Kennicott's list with further description of prints and criticism, and adds his own list of additional manuscripts and prints.

for its presentation of the agreements of the Hebrew variants with the Versions, including the Syriac and Arabic. Bär's edition is valuable for its 'Annotationes Criticæ,' with the listing of Masoretic variants, the differences between Oriental and Occidental readings, and the 'Diversitates libri Regum a libri Chronicorum,' and 'a libri Jesaïæ,' and 'a libri Jeremiæ.' Ginsburg's first edition presented variant readings. His second edition gives a far larger presentation of this material in the footnotes, page by page, along with the distinction of Oriental and Occidental readings, extensive citation of early prints, as also his own suggested correction of text, 'necesse est legere.'³ And in suit the critical apparatus in Kittel-Noth's edition gives current citation of selected variants based on earlier text-editors, and selected MSS, along with extensive citation of the Versions and critical judgments upon them and their bearing upon the Hebrew text.⁴

For Ki. Kennicott cites at length 66 MSS, along with very many cited in places for him by C. Bruns. See his 'Catalogus Codicum,' including synagogal Haftarothe and prints, following the text of Ki. For the same book de Rossi consulted 42 original additional texts in his own library, 34 others on occasion. In many cases these MSS contain only the Former Prophets.⁵

In addition to the innumerable variations, in large part errors, yet often scribal corrections of impossible or unintelligible Hebrew, occurring in most authoritative MSS, as also the variations between presence and absence of the vowel-letters, or their faulty placement (the simpler form often giving the basis of interpretation by the Versions), there are

³ See at large his invaluable *Introduction*, and for excellent surveys of the Heb. text Buhl, *Canon u. Text*, §§24 ff., Briggs, *Int.*, ch. 7. For recent catalogues of the Heb. MSS see Bibliography in Buhl, p. 86, and Ginsburg, ch. 12.

⁴ See the extensive apparatus listed in the 'Prolegomena.' Few fragments of the Babylonian texts appear for Ki.; cf. Kahle, *Masoretien des Ostens*, *BWAT* 15 (1913), and 'Die hebräischen Bibelhandschriften aus Babylonien,' *ZAW* 46 (1928), 113 ff.

⁵ By inadvertence some numbers of Kennicott's citations are erroneously cited below through the Commentary, as 'MSS,' whereas they are actually prints; this correction concerns the particular numbers 257, 260, 264, 650 [J.A.M.].

the many corrections by the vocal $\text{K}\ddot{\text{r}}\text{ê}$, which have again to be diagnosed for their correctness. There also appear cases of the Sebirin, instances of 'it is the opinion that it is so and so,' the correction marginally annotated.⁶

For Ki. criticism is further complicated by the extensive current parallelisms, and again towards the end of the book by the parallels for II. 18-20 with Isaiah, for II. 24, 25 with Jeremiah, and for ch. 25 by a double parallel in Jer.⁷ Accordingly we thus possess text-traditions of great antiquity. And the problem is further vexed by the inter-contamination among the parallels (affecting particularly the Versions at large), the greater fullness or preciseness or more extensive editing of one of the parallels affecting the sister text, hence the influence of the text of Ch. upon that of Ki., still more manifest in the Grr. See such a case at II. 25⁴, where the verb demanded before "by night," was early lacking in the Heb., which then has been variously supplied in four MSS ("and they went out," "and they fled"), in the parallel in Jer., and in the ancient and modern VSS (AV supplies the verb without further note, JV inserts in brackets—so translators must work!). A sample case of correction of the Heb., doubtless an original error, appears at I. 7¹⁸: here "the pillars" and "the pomegranates" should change place; corrections are made by 2 MSS, reading the second word in

⁶ For recent discussions of Kethib- $\text{K}\ddot{\text{r}}\text{ê}$ are to be noticed the book by Gordis on the subject (with additions to Bär's list for Ki.), and the criticism of it by Orlinsky, both listed in the Bibliography. For the Sebirin see Ginsb., *Int.*, ch. 8; e.g., cases at I. 1¹⁰, 1¹⁸, 3¹, 18²⁶, II. 2³. Friedr. Delitzsch, in *Die Lese- u. Schreibfehler im A.T.*, presents a list of some 400 alleged errors in K of Ki. The acute theory of Boström, presented in his *Alternative Readings* in Samuel, will be pursued in the Notes below.

⁷ These parallelisms are fully presented by Bär, pp. 132 ff., cf. Kuenen, *Einl.*, §45. The most comprehensive work in this regard is Vanutelli's *Libri synoptici*, presenting the parallel texts of Is., Jer., Ch., along with the several parallel Gr. texts, and a rich assortment of the Gr. variants. For an analytic study of these variants is to be noted Rehm, *Textkritische Untersuchungen*, and for such textual discrepancies Sperber, 'Hebrew Based upon Biblical Passages in Parallel Transmission.' Klost., Kent, Šanda most conveniently present the parallelisms in translation, as does also Crockett in his *Harmony*. For the particular literature on the several sections see Comm., *ad locos*, e.g., Add. Note on II. 18-20.

both cases, again by some 50 MSS with the first word in both cases, while the VSS, except \mathfrak{S} , support \mathfrak{H} . That is, corrections often entailed further error.

The pursuit of variant readings of particular MSS in the history of text and VSS is of interest and of possible value. Kennicott finds a sample case in his no. 1, an excellent Bodleian MS; for the Pentateuch he notes some 2000 variants, 'not a few of them of moment,' and as confirming in some cases the ancient VSS.⁸ An example may be presented for Ki. in Ken. MS 30. In several cases (*e.g.*, I. 4²⁰, 14¹¹, 15⁶, 19², II. 6²⁵, 9³⁷) it has rdgs., alone or along with a few other MSS, agreeing variously with \mathfrak{G} \mathfrak{S} \mathfrak{A} vs. \mathfrak{H} ; further correspondences with particular rdgs. of Gr. MSS appear at II. 15³⁸, 19³⁷, 22¹. Other MSS may be cited for occasional notable correspondences with the Gr., *e.g.*, MS 2 (I. 6³⁹), 23 (II. 21⁸), 70 (I. 8⁴⁰. 41. 46, II. 17⁸, 24¹⁰), 174 (II. 10¹, 'Samaria' for 'Jezreel'), 180 (II. 9³², 20¹= \mathfrak{G} ^L). But guard must be taken concerning individual MSS; thus MS 253 contains 'multas egregias variationes,' to quote de Rossi, and Kennicott holds that 'written in 1495, it was influenced by printed Bibles.'⁹

Accordingly the variations of Heb. MSS, as well as of editions, will be cited currently in the Notes, when they appear to be of interest, even if not of value. Their importance for text criticism may be judged only case by case. We must allow for the ecclesiastically less important Prophets a greater liberty taken with the texts, often in consequence of their human interest. Various cautions have to be borne in mind

⁸ 'Dissertatio' at end of vol. 2, p. 71. Particular study of the Hebrew variants and so of the classification of the MSS has been sorely lacking. Hempel gave a 'Chronik' on the subject in *ZAW* 1930, 187 ff., and also a further study in the Göttingen *Nachrichten*, Philolog.-hist. Klasse, 1937, 227 ff. S. H. Blank has made a comparative textual study of a recently discovered MS in *HUCA* 8-9 (1932), 227 ff. Bewer has treated Ken. 96 in connexion with a brief passage in the G. A. Kohut Vol., pp. 86 ff. For other individual studies see Orłinsky's note 12 in his 'Present State of Proto-Septuagint Studies.'

⁹ Some MSS come from the hands of Jewish proselytes to the Church, and so have been contaminated; a specimen is given by the writer in his *Daniel*, p. 13, and such a MS is noted by de Rossi, his MS 69, commented on in vol. i, p. cxxxii. His corrections of Kennicott's often too early datings are to be noted.

by the critic. For the early age the acquaintance of scribes with Greek must have insensibly, *memoriter*, affected their texts. Indeed the part of memory in ancient text transmission has been rather ignored by modern critics, who appear to visualize ancient scribes as painfully collating various texts and parallels. This outlook explains the later variety in citation of the Greek Bible, as in the case of St. Paul, who knew his Hebrew (a disciple of Gamaliel he was, according to Acts 22³), the oral Targum of his day, and the current Greek translation, and who also could supply his own fresh translations. See further §11.

For the dialectical varieties in Ki. Burney in his *Hebrew Text . . . of Kings*, 207 ff., gives a useful list; almost all of them belong to the North Israelite narratives, appearing also in Jud. and Sam., and surviving in much later literature. Cf. also the useful summary in Dr., *Int.*, 188, n. 1. There may be noted the form of the 2d fem. sing. pronoun 'attî, and the corresponding suffix -kî (appearing also in Punic). The relative šē occurs once (II. 6¹¹). The development of 'āšer as a demonstrative relative element = 'he-of,' a replica of šē, occurs at II. 19¹². Noticeable is the almost absence of loan-words from the Aramaic. Kautzsch in his *Aramaismen im A.T.* (1902) presents only two certain cases, איכה, II. 6¹, and הירה, I. 10¹, which occurs frequently earlier in Num. (E) and Jud.; to these cases may be added קלעים, I. 6³⁴, צלחית, II. 2²⁰, and the pl. forms צרנין, I. 11³³, II. 11¹³.

There occurs the frequent avoidance of the usual rules for consecution of verbs with Waw, e.g., II. 5²⁰, 12¹²; see Dr., *Tenses*, ch. 9, citing many cases in Ki., and F. T. Kelly, 'The Impf. with Simple Waw,' *JBL* 1920, 1 ff., citing with analysis the cases in Ki., pp. 10 ff. There are also many cases, as in the Samaritan Pentateuch, of the unapocopated impf. with consecutive Waw.¹⁰

¹⁰ For the most recent study of the Canaanite development of the aspects' (traditionally 'tenses') see Harris, *Development of the Canaanite Dialects*, pp. 83 ff.

II. ANCIENT VERSIONS

§3. THE APPARATUS AT LARGE

Of the two great Polyglot Bibles containing the Oriental Versions, that of Paris (edited by Le Jay, completed 1645), and that of London (edited by Brian Walton, completed 1657), the latter has been used in this work. For Ki. it contains in parallel columns along with the Hebrew the Latin of the Vulgate, the Greek, the Syriac, these two with Latin translations, and at the bottom of the opposite pages the Targum and the Arabic, also with like translations.¹ Of particular value are de Rossi's summaries of the variants in Hebrew MSS and the Versions in selected passages.

The Old Testament in Greek (the Cambridge *OTG*), edited by Brooke, McLean, Thackeray, provides comparative textual apparatus for the Versions dependent upon the Greek, namely the Sahidic-Coptic, Ethiopic, Christian-Palestinian, the Syriac Hexapla, Armenian, Old Latin.² The 'Polychrome' edition of the *Book of Kings* in P. Haupt's *SBOT*, edited by Stade and Schwally, with constant and often contradictory notes by Haupt, is an invaluable select treasury of materials of the VSS bearing upon the text. There is to be noted also the extensive accumulation of variations of the VSS in Kittel's *BH*. For the Versions see Burney, *Kings*, pp. xx seq., and Driver, *Notes on the Hebrew Text . . . of the Books of Samuel*, pp. xxxiii seq., discussing a text closely related to that of Ki. General reference may be here made to Swete, *Int. to the O.T.*

¹ Vol. VI of this invaluable work also contains a series of pertinent addenda: Variants to and Observations on the Targum; Variant Readings of the Syriac; ditto of the Arabic. The extensive apparatus of comparisons of the Greek and Latin texts with manuscripts and earlier prints of the Bible is of bibliophilic interest, and the long 'Nota' by Flaminius Nobilius (d. 1590), of 196 pages, on the Greek translation, is a fine specimen of early critical scholarship.

² See the Preface to vol. I, and for the increment of material the Prefaces to parts 1 and 2 of vol. II (Kgdms). The work also methodically lists citations of the Biblical text found in Philo, the N.T., Josephus and the Patristic writings. For critical discussion of such citations and also for a much wider field, see Rahlfs, *SS* 3, ch. 1, §§7, 8, ch. 3 (Josephus), ch. 4.

in *Greek* (for the Gr. MSS of the Historical Books, pp. 154 ff. ; for the sub-versions of the Gr., part I, ch. 4), and to the articles on the VSS in BDD, *JE* ; also to the bibliography and critical results given by the writer in Int. to his *Daniel*. There is to be added now for the Greek VSS, the Peshitta, the Vulgate, Pfeiffer, *Int.*, 104 ff.

§4. THE GREEK VERSIONS

a. *The Apparatus*

The largest thesaurus of rdgs. of the Greek MSS still remains that of Holmes and Parsons. Its place is most conveniently, but not wholly, taken by the Cambridge *OTG* ; see §3. Alongside of this monumental work is to be placed for usefulness in the study of Kings and Chronicles Vanutelli's *Libri synoptici V.T.*, cited in §2, n. 7, presenting along with the Hebrew texts their respective Greek and Latin translations (the texts of Swete and Heyse-Tischendorf), along with a finely articulated apparatus of rdgs. of the Gr. MSS arranged in groups, *i.e.*, Origenian, Lucianic, sub-Lucianic, sub-Alexandrian ; the rdgs. of the Syro-Hexapla and the parallels in Josephus are included.

Tischendorf-Nestle's and Swete's editions of the Gr. O.T. cite for uncial codices in this book only B (Codex Vaticanus) and A (Codex Alexandrinus).¹ The Cambridge *OTG* and Vanutelli treat as one uncial manuscript (as indeed long observed) the codex cited by them as N, known to HP as two distinct MSS, XI and 23 ; and so also an uncial MS Coislinianus 1, cited as M, extending only for I. 1-8⁴⁶. There are also fragments of an uncial Z. The most recent edition of the Greek text is Rahlfs's *Septuaginta*, presenting a revision of the text of B and an apparatus of the pertinent variants. In this connexion is to be noted the Göttingen *Septuaginta*, instituted by Rahlfs, with large critical apparatus and introductions ; Rahlfs himself edited *Genesis* (1926) and *Psalms*

¹ In addition to the earlier autotype facsimile of the latter codex a reduced facsimile reproduction has been published by the British Museum, edited by F. G. Kenyon, 1915, *seq.* See at large Kenyon's *Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts*, 1940.

cum Odis, followed by W. Kappler, *Maccabæorum Liber I* (1936), and J. Ziegler, *Isaias* (1939).²

b. *The Alexandrian (Septuagintal) Group* (⊗)

The one uncial MS of the group, the regnant text of all modern editions, is Codex B, Vaticanus. Despite the corrections of 'correctores,' this noble MS abounds in glaring faults (shared in also by Codex A), particularly in transliterations, but also in other quarters, and this often uniquely, as the Notes will show. Its text may not, *per se*, be used for statistical comparison, except upon critical comparison with related MSS and sub-versions, especially the Ethiopic. Its own particular Greek group is small.³ For the problem whether

² The first part of N (HP MS XI) is in the Vatican Library; it extends over Ki. The second (HP 23) is in the Library of St. Mark's, Venice (hence also known as Venetus). See Swete, *Int.*, 131 f., and vol. III of his text, p. xiv, and Montg., *Daniel*, 26, 51. In *OTG*, through an earlier omission, reference to this MS is to be found in Preface to part 3 of vol. 1. For M (HP X, not cited there for Ki.) see Swete, *Int.*, 140, and Rahlfs, *SS* 3, 32 f. MS Z is noticed by *OTG* in Preface to Kings; by Rahlfs, *SS* 3, 193, n. 2. For the MSS at large see Swete, *Int.*, ch. 5, Rahlfs's encyclopædic *Verzeichnis d. griech. Handschriften d. A.T.*, and his detailed critical discussions in *SS* 1 and 3. Most recent is the ample discussion of the Gr. uncial MSS of the O.T. by J. H. Ropes in vol. 3 (1926) of *The Beginnings of Christianity* (ed. by F. J. F. Jackson and K. Lake), pp. lxxxviii, *seq.* In addition to Nestle, 'Septuagint,' *DB*, there are to be cited among recent studies: O. Procksch, *Studien zur Geschichte der Septuaginta* (1910), and his 'Tetraplarische Studien,' *ZAW* 1936, 240 ff., 1937, 61 ff., covering the theme as far as Ruth; Kenyon, *The Text of the Greek Bible*, 1937; also the articles by Olmstead, 'Source Study and the Biblical Text,' and 'The Earliest Book of Kings' (see Bibliography). The final results of M. L. Margolis's monumental *The Book of Joshua in Greek* (parts I-IV, 1931-38) have not yet been published. He gave a preliminary statement in 'The Grouping of the Codices in the Gr. Joshua,' *JQR* 1 (1910), 259 ff.; *cf.* also his essay on 'Textual Criticism of the Gr. O.T.,' *Proc. Am. Philos. Soc.*, 1928, 187 ff. A. Allgeier's recent volume, *Die Chester-Beatty Papyri zum Pentateuch; Untersuchungen zur älteren Überlieferungsgeschichte der Septuaginta* (1938), gives a full discussion of results from that quarter. See also further literature cited in §11, n. 6.

The alphabetic symbols for the cursive MSS will be used below, following *OTG* and Vanutelli, with occasional references to numbered MSS of HP not included in the former system.

³ The writer has expressed his criticism of uncritical use of B as basis of textual comparison in a review, *JBL* 1936, 309 ff. For a recent study see Sperber, *Septuagintaprobleme I*, *BWANT* III, 13 (1929).

there was more than one archetype of the Septuagint see the literature of the discussion in §II, note 6.

c. The Later Jewish Translators, Theodotion, Aquila, Symmachus, etc.

For placing Theodotion's name first, see the writer's *Daniel*, p. 46. For the additional texts known at large to Origen, but of unknown *provenance*, the Quinta, Sexta, Septima, see Field's *Hexapla*, vol. I, Prolegomena, ch. 5, and Swete, *Int.*, pt. I, ch. 3. Field's invaluable work cites all the then known citations made by Origen and others from those obscure translations; these are also duly registered with an increment of additions in *OTG*. For Aquila there have now been recovered six large papyrus leaves of his translation of Kings, discovered by S. Schechter in the Cairo Genizah, and published by Burkitt and Taylor in *Fragments of the Books of Kings*. This material includes I. 20⁷⁻¹⁷, II. 23¹²⁻²⁷.⁴ The thesaurus of these translations is the Syriac Hexapla (see §6, *b*), plus marginal citations in some Greek MSS, notably M and j (=243); see Rahlfs, *SS* 3, 32 ff. Remains of the cited Quinta appear frequently for 2 Ki., never for 1 Ki.⁵ The effect of Theodotion upon the history of the Greek text remains obscure; he is cited frequently along with Aquila and Symmachus, but rarely alone; see further §II, *c*.

d. Origen's Revision and its Successors (6^H)

Origen prepared two texts, the Hexapla and the reduced Tetrapla. A further revision of his (Palestinian) text was produced by Eusebius under Constantine's command (the

⁴ Valuable textual notes are added by the editors. See in general J. Reider, *Prolegomena to Aquila*, Philadelphia, 1916. For the relation of Aquila and Targum see Silberstein's work, cited in Note introductory to I. 1.

⁵ See Burkitt, 'The So-Called Quinta of 4 Kings,' *PSBA* 24 (1902), 216 ff., citing instances where "readings of the so-called Quinta preserve a valuable emendation of the Mas. text"; E. Nestle, *ib.*, 25, 63; Olmstead, 'The Earliest Book of Kings,' who rediscovers Quinta in 1 Ki., proposing it as the basis of the Gr. in that portion of the book, and with stress on the critical importance of the version (pp. 184 ff.).

Constantinopolitan text).⁶ The MSS of this group are promiscuous in their readings. Of the uncials, A N belong here; M has 'a vulgar text,' 'influenced by the Hexapla' (Rahlfs, SS 3, 32). Codex A, like B, is carelessly written, and often runs independently of its fellows, indeed is often found in particular, even unique, correspondence with B.⁷ For Ki. Vanutelli selects as cursives of this group MSS c x y (HP 376 247 121).⁸

In this connexion may be noted Origen's Alexandrian counterpart, Hesychius (martyred under Galerius), who produced a revision of the Greek Bible. But no precision of Hesychian texts has been made for Ki.⁹

e. *The Lucianic Revision* (Ⓞ^L)

See at large Rahlfs, SS 3, the outstanding work on the criticism of the problematic text of Lucian and its correlations.¹⁰ In 1883 Paul de Lagarde published his *Librorum V.T. canonicorum pars prior* (part 2 never appeared)—a cryptic title indeed, for the volume is a presentation of the Lucianic text of Gen.—2 Esd., devoid of any textual apparatus. Following Vercellone he based his text on MSS 19 82 93 108 (=OTG b' o e₂b). His volume has become the staple for dis-

⁶ See Field's *Prolegomena*, Swete, *Int.*, 18 ff., the writer's *Daniel*, *Int.*, §14, and in particular for the present subject Rahlfs, SS 1, 47 ff., 'Origenis Zitate aus den Königsbüchern.' There may be noted in addition two important studies, by Margolis, 'Hexapla and Hexaplaric,' *AJSL* 32 (1916), 126 ff., and by Orłinsky, 'The Columnar Order of the Hexapla,' *JQR* 27 (1936), 137 ff.

⁷ See the full study, including much more than its title indicates, by S. Silberstein, 'Über den Ursprung der im Codex Alexandrinus u. Vaticanus des dritten Königsbuches der alexandrinischen Übersetzung überlieferten Textgestalt,' *ZAW* 13 (1893), 1-75; 14, 1-30.

⁸ For analysis of MSS of this group see Margolis, 'Hexapla and Hexaplaric,' cited above. For Joshua he accepts a different group from the above, namely 15 (=a) 27 64 78.

⁹ See Nestle, *DB* 4, 445, col. 2; Swete, *Int.*, 18 ff.

¹⁰ For the credit for recognition of this group see *ib.*, p. 80, n. 1. Lucian, martyred in the year 311/12, was a Syrian of Antioch, and belonged to a different school of Biblical tradition than that of Alexandria (Septuagint, Hesychius) and that of Cæsarea (Origen). For these three schools see Jerome's 'Præfatio in Paralip.' in his 'Prologus Galeatus' (Tischendorf, p. xlvi). Burney, pp. xx-xxxi, gives a long list of Gr. rdgs., mostly parallelisms of Ⓞ and Ⓞ^L; but Ⓞ is cited only from faulty B.

cussion of the text in question. But de Lagarde's method and text have undergone drastic criticism by Rahlfs with his study of all Lucianic clues and exposure of de Lagarde's many arbitrary readings. He adds as a major Lucianic MS no. 127=c₂, and comes to the conclusion that o and e₂ are far superior to the others. Related MSS are 56 (=i) 158 245.¹¹ Vanutelli ('Prolegomena,' vi) follows much the same grouping, adding other MSS as 'sub-Lucianic.' Readings from this source have largely affected, often as glosses, other MSS (Rahlfs, SS 3, 30 ff.).

§5. THE TARGUM (Ⓣ)

The text of the 'Targum of Jonathan' primarily followed here is that of de Lagarde's *Prophetæ Chaldaice* (Ⓣ^l), based upon a single MS, the Codex Reuchlinianus, of date 1105, itself containing many annotated variants, listed in the Preface, along with variants of other printed texts. To Walton's edition of the Targum in the London Polyglot (Ⓣ^w) S. le Clerc (Clericus) has contributed a long essay in vol. 6, 'Variæ lectiones in Chaldaicam paraphrasin.'¹ We have to postulate early oral Targums in paraphrastic citation of the Scriptures. Their literary composition was not effected until a late date; according to Hamburger, *RE* 2, 1184 f., Targum Jonathan was not earlier than the 4th century. For the influence of oral Targums upon other translations, cf. §11, *d*, and P. Churgin, 'The Targum and the Septuagint,' *AJSL* 50 (1933-34), 41 ff., with discussion of earlier literature.

§6. THE SYRIAC VERSIONS

a. The Peshitta (Ⓢ)

The earliest Syriac version was so named, 'the Simple,' in contrast to the later composite Hexaplaric text. The text

¹¹ N.b. his discussion of 82 in SS 1, 3 ff.

¹ Kahle, in *Masoretten des Ostens* (1913), 25 ff., presents a Babylonian text of the Hebrew and Targum of 2 Sam. 24¹⁶⁻¹ Ki. 1¹⁵, with Bab. punctuation; similarly A. Sperber, 'Zur Sprache des Prophetentargums,' *ZAW* 1927, 267 ff., presents I. 17-19 with the same punctuation.

here used is that of the London Polyglot, which is supplemented in vol. 6 by H. Thorndike's 'Variantes in Syriaca versione V. T. lectiones.'¹

b. The Syro-Hexapla (S^H)

The term indicates the Syriac translation of Origen's Hexaplaric Greek text, with citation of the latter's critical apparatus, made by Paul of Tella in the year 616-17, and surviving in one MS in the Ambrosian Library in Milan.² The edition of the text used here is de Lagarde's notable publication, *Bibliothecæ Syriacæ* (1892), covering Gen.-Ki. (the earlier books largely fragmentary). For Sam.-1 Ki. 1¹⁻⁴⁹ OTG also adds the glosses of a 'patchwork text,' revision of the Peshitta from the Greek; see vol. 2, pt. 1, p. viii. There are also the Hexaplaric citations in a great work by Abu-l-Farāj, surnamed Barhebræus; these are cited in OTG.³

§7. THE ETHIOPIC (E)

The text used here is that of Dillmann, *V.T. Æthiopicum*. His 'Apparatus Criticus,' following 1 and 2 Kgdms and 3 and 4 Kgdms, contains variants, conspectus of variations

¹ This text is repeated in Lee's edition, published by the British and Foreign Bible Society (1823). For the Syriac versions in general see E. Nestle, 'Syriac Versions,' *DB*; A. Baumstark, *Gesch. d. syrischen Literatur*, §4 (listing the Bible translations, and with full bibliography); L. Haefeli, *Die Peshitta des A.T.* (1927); and for particular notice of MSS and prints, W. E. Barnes, 'The Peshitta Version of 2 Kings,' *JTS* 6 (1905), 220 ff. For a discussion of the relation of S to E see J. Bloch, 'The Influence of the Greek Bible on the Peshitta,' *AJSL* 36 (1920), 161 ff., with full bibliography, but arriving at no definite results; cf. also his earlier article, 'Authorship of the Peshitta,' *ib.*, vol. 35, 215 ff. Of particular interest for the Syriac tradition and interpretation of text are the Scholia of Barhebræus; see note 3.

² For the literature see *Daniel*, Int., §10, *d*, and for the translator and his work, Baumstark, pp. 186 ff.

³ He lived 1225-86; see at length Baumstark, pp. 312-21. The material appears in his encyclopædic *Auṣar Rāzē*, 'Treasury of Mysteries.' A. Morgenstern has published the text for Ki., *Die Scholien des Gregorius Abulfarag, Barhebraeus genannt, zum Buch der Könige* (1925). M. Sprengling and W. C. Graham have published the first volume of *Barhebraeus' Scholia on the O.T.* (Chicago, 1931), covering Gen.-2 Sam. These scholia to the Biblical books introduce the Origenian ('Ionian') readings, as also direct translations from the Hebrew.

from the LXX, etc. There are to be noted particular presentations of fresh MSS: by N. Roupp, 'Die älteste aethiop. Handschrift der vier Bücher der Könige,' *ZA* 1902, 296 ff.; and H. S. Gehman, 'The Old Eth. Version of 1 Kings and its Affinities,' *JBL* 1931, 81 ff.¹

§8. THE ARABIC (A)

The text here followed is that of the London Polyglot, reprint from that of Paris. For the Arabic versions at large see H. Hyvernat's extensive discussion, 'Arabes (Versions),' in Vigouroux's *DB*; F. C. Burkitt, *DB* 1, 137 f.; P. Kahle, *Die arab. Bibelübersetzungen, Texte mit Glossar* (1904); and the recent summary account by Gehman, 'The Polyglot Arabic of Daniel and its Affinities,' *JBL* 1925, 327 ff. *OTG* does not present the readings of this version.²

§9. OTHER ORIENTAL VERSIONS

a. The Syro-Palestinian (B)

For the fragments in this dialect in Ki. see Pref. Note, in *OTG*. The dialect is Judæo-Palestinian, written in Syriac characters, coming from a Christian Church of Melkite persuasion, which was originally dependent upon the Syrian Church at Edessa. A group of these Palestinians at unknown date migrated to Egypt. Here their literary remains have been found, almost all lectionary material.³

b. The Coptic (C)

There exist only fragments of the Sahidic dialect for Ki. On the textual value of the Coptic versions see Prefatory Note in *OTG*, vol. 1.

¹ Gehman has used in comparison with Dillmann's text an unpublished Eth. MS in the Vatican library, photographic copy of which is in the Library of the Philadelphia Divinity School; he supplies an ample Bibliography. For other critical material see §11, a.

² There may be noted in this connexion J. F. Rhode, *The Arabic Version of the Pentateuch in the Church of Egypt* (Catholic Univ. Thesis, 1921), and Gehman, 'The Arabic Bible in Spain,' *Speculum*, 1 (1926), 219 ff.

³ For the dialect see Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, 1, 16; F. Schultess, *Lexicon Syropalaestinum* (1903); Duval, *La littérature syriaque*; Nestle, *DB* 4, 649; Rosenthal, *Die aramaistische Forschung*, pp. 144 ff.

c. *The Armenian* (Arm.)

OTG presents this text as \mathfrak{A} . See Gehman, 'The Armenian Version of I and II Kings,' *JAOS* 1934, 53 ff., and his similar treatment of the Armenian text of Daniel in *ZAW* 1930, 82 ff., these with full bibliographies. Over this language and the Coptic the present writer has no control.

§10. THE LATIN VERSIONS

a. *The Old Latin* (\mathfrak{L})

The material from old Latin MSS with pre-Hieronymian text is registered in *OTG*; see Pref. Note in vol. 2. Early Patristic citations offer still richer material; see index of sources used in *OTG*, Pref. Note in vol. 1. The citations by Lucifer of Cagliari are the most extensive.¹

b. *The Vulgate* (\mathfrak{V})

The text used is the Clementine text published by Heyse and Tischendorf—cited under the latter's name. This has value for its annotation of the readings of Codex Amiatinus, generally more original than the *textus receptus*.² The official *Biblia Sacra*, 6 (Rome, 1945) has also been consulted.

III. GROUPING OF THE VERSIONS

§11. a. *The Alexandrian Family*

Of the above versions only the Grr., the Targum, the Syriac Peshitta, and the Vulgate are direct translations

¹ See H. A. A. Kennedy, 'Latin Versions, The Old,' *DB*. Extensive citations of \mathfrak{L} are given by Dr., *Samuel*, pp. lxxvi-lxxx, and by Burn., *Judges*, pp. xxxv-xxxix, for the most part in exhibits taken from the Codex Gothicus Legionensis (on which see Rahlfs, *SS* 3, 157 ff.). See Bibliography for Lucifer's text; cf. Rahlfs, §35. For this extensive field see also the writer's *Daniel*, Int., §10, b, and R. S. Hauptert, *Relation of Cod. Vat. and the Lucianic text of . . . Kings from the Viewpoint of the Old Latin and Ethiopic Versions* (Univ. of Penna. Thesis, 1930).

² See W. Nowack, *Die Bedeutung des Hieronymus für die Alttest. Kritik* (1875), H. J. White, 'Vulgate,' *DB*.

from the Hebrew; the others are translations of Greek Versions.¹

Codex B and its Greek fellows rate historically as Alexandrian, or Old Greek. But the text in Ki. hails evidently from more than one hand, and there arises the question whether it is, in part or altogether, properly Septuagintal, or of other origin, related to the obscure Theodotonic and Lucianic strains of translation. This will be discussed below in *c*.

Versions of the Alexandrian family are the Coptic and the Ethiopic. For the former, see Pref. Note to Ki., in *OTG*: The Sahidic "cannot safely be used except when," etc. The Ethiopic after the general fashion of the version in its earliest form, is a peculiarly careful translation, and pairs regularly with Codex B, often uniquely, is free of its glaring errors, and so is its best 'corrector.' See Rahlfs and the other literature cited in §7, and note Olmstead's summary statement in 'The Earliest Book of Kings,' p. 171, to the effect that agreement of *℄* with other groups as against B must mean that such a reading is correct. For possible relationship of *℄* to the Lucianic group, see *c* below. It is possible that *℄* in some cases drew directly from *℔*, *i.e.*, cases where it is in sole agreement with the latter.

b. The Palestinian (Origenian) Family

The place of the Syro-Hexapla as the best exemplar of this group, with its critical collection of readings from Origen's massive work, has been described above. The close dependence of *ℒ* upon Origen's version will be noted below in *d*. The place of the Armenian in the same group has been determined by Gehman in his summing up (*JAOS* 54, p. 59): "Arm. is a faithful representative of the group. . . . We can place Arm. on the same level with A and 247. . . . There are a few influences from the Lucianic MSS . . ." For revisions

¹ On the character of the Oriental sub-versions the remarks in Pref. Note, *OTG*, vol. I, pt. I, are of value. For the subject at large see Ropes, *op. cit.* (§4, n. 2), pp. cxlii, *seq.*, for discussion of the Oriental versions of the N.T. There is desiderated greater co-operation between the students of the two Testaments, *e.g.*, in the common problem of the 'Western Text.'

and translations of the Hexaplaric text, *cf.* the writer's *Daniel*, Int. §14.

c. The Lucianic Revision and its Background ; the Problem of a Pre-Lucianic or Pre-Theodotonic Version ; Citations in Josephus and the New Testament

The Syro-Palestinian texts known for Ki. are definitely Lucianic ; see Duval, *Litt. syriaque*, p. 60.

The appearance of Lucianic rdgs. in centuries preceding Lucian (martyred A.D. 311/12), along with their occurrence in Old Latin texts, has raised complicated problems still unsolved. This is particularly the case with the Biblical citations in Josephus.² Mez established the fact that for Samuel, Josephus followed most largely a Greek text of pre-Lucianic, pre-Theodotonic character. But for Ki. Rahlfs came to the conclusion that Josephus chiefly used the Hebrew text, and he discovers only two positive Lucianic rdgs., bearing on I. 3²⁵ and II. 11¹⁰. *Per contra*, Thackeray, ignorant of Rahlfs's study, asserts (p. 85) : " the Josephan text is *uniformly* of this Lucianic type from 1 Samuel to 1 Maccabees." And so authorities disagree in their critical results, as will also be exemplified further below.

The N.T. citations from Ki. are few and cast no definite light ; see Rahlfs, §24, and for the subject at large Sperber, ' N.T. and Septuagint,' *JBL* 1940, 193 ff., but with no references to the citations from Ki. The following cases to the point may be noted : of the some dozen citations in the N.T. Luke 4²⁶ της Σιδωνίας = Ⓞ I. 17⁹ (Jos., Ⓞ^L Σιδωνος) ; Luke 4²⁷, Ναιμαν = Ⓞ II. 5²⁰ (Ⓞ^L Νεεμαν) ; Rom. 11⁴, καταλιπον = MS i, I. 19¹⁸ (Ⓞ^L καταλειψω, B erroneously καταλειψεις). In the last citation again εκαμψαν = Ⓞ^L I. 19¹⁸ (Ⓞ ωκλασαν) is the only sure case of a Lucianic rdg. Luke 9⁵⁴ cites II. 11¹⁰, but with an original verb, αναλίσκειν. Rev. 11⁶ cites I. 17¹, again with

² For earlier literature see Schürer, *GJV* I, 103. Of his references is to be especially cited A. Mez, *Die Bibel des Josephus untersucht für Buch V-VII der Archäologie* (1895), treating the books Josh., Jud., Sam. The one thorough treatment of Ki. is by Rahlfs in ch. 3 of his SS 3. Since then Thackeray has presented a study of the subject in Lect. 4 of his *Josephus, the Man and the Historian*. For the extensive amount of such 'Ur-Theodotonic' material in the Greek texts of Daniel see the writer's Comm., Int., §§12 ff.

an original verb, $\beta\rho\epsilon\chi\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon$. The best texts of Mt. 10²⁵ and parallels have the original and actually correct rdg., 'Baal-zebul,' *vs.* 'Baal-zebug,' at II. 1²; see Note, *ad loc.* There is also to be noted the ancient Jewish tradition of the famine in Elijah's time as lasting for three and a half years, cited in Luke 4²⁵, Jam. 5¹⁷; see Comm., I. 17¹.

No definite results from such a quarter as Josephus, a free re-composer of the Biblical history, can be gained. One complication is, as Thackeray suggests (pp. 81 f.), 'the apparent influence of a Targum'; for such cases see Notes on I. 21²⁷, II. 9²⁰. Josephus was a scholarly gentleman, who knew his Hebrew text fairly by heart, and could make his own translations; he was acquainted with the normative Septuagint, and also equally with current oral Greek translations (properly 'Targums,' *i.e.*, 'interpretations'). His citations are similar to those of the Apostle Paul, who cited at great length from Scripture, but with no manuscripts at hand (*cf.* 2 Tim. 4¹³). And the like independence appears in the N.T. citations from Ki. noted above.³

Rahlfs continues (ch. 4) his criticism of alleged 'Lucianic' citations in the pre-Lucianic Greek Patristic writers, and finds but a small sheaf of gleanings. In the Latin field his study (ch. 5) of the pre-Hieronymian writers and excerpts of Old Latin MSS is crucial for a very moot question.⁴ Driver's conclusion (p. lxxvi) is worthy of citation: "The Old Latin must date from the second century A.D., hence it cannot be based upon the recension of Lucian as such; its peculiar interest lies in the fact that it affords independent evidence of the existence of MSS containing characteristic readings (or renderings) considerably before the time of Lucian

³ The place of oral tradition in antiquity, as *vs.* the written, is now coming into recognition. See S. Gandz, 'Oral Tradition in the Bible,' G. A. Kohut Vol., pp. 248 ff.; H. S. Nyberg, 'Das textkritische Problem des A.T. am Hoseabuche,' *ZAW* 1934, 241 ff., and *Studien zum Hoseabuche*, *Uppsala Universitets Årskrift*, 1935, pt. 6. And, as has not been sufficiently recognized, the mutual cross-relations of the extensive parallels between Ki. and Is., Jer., Ch., have been largely affected by intrusions *memoriter*.

⁴ See the literature noted in §10, a. Rahlfs's study of the Patristic texts in SS 3 was preceded in Heft 1 with a study of Theodoret's and Origen's citations from Ki.

himself.”⁵ However Rahlfs cites and directly contradicts this statement of Driver’s (in the latter’s first edition), insisting (pp. 158 ff.) that no certain Lucianic citations in the Latin appear before Lucifer of Cagliari (d. 371). This rebuttal is simply noted by Driver in ed. 2, p. lxxvi, as a footnote to the repetition of his statement noted above.

But Rahlfs’s own argument is difficult to appraise. After a long discussion of Lucian’s agreements with Codex B and \mathfrak{C} in Ki. he arrives at the conclusion (§57, *cf.* p. 255), that ‘the base of Lucian is an old pre-Hexaplaric \mathfrak{G} -text, which is most closely related to B and \mathfrak{C} .’ But this result is not at all satisfactory in view of the evident relation of the Lucianic MSS with pre-Lucianic witness.

Thackeray, in his article in *JTS* and in his book, *The Septuagint*, etc., pp. 16 ff., has presented a most interesting thesis, evidently confirmed by statistics of language, to the effect that Gr. Kingdoms is the result of two partial translations: the first (‘Alexandrian’) omitting the ‘unedifying’ portions of the history, and covering I Kgd.–II. 11¹, III. 2¹²–21⁴³, the lacunæ being then filled up by a later translator, with further discussion of the latter’s relation to Theodotion, or rather an *Ur*-Theodotion, ‘an anonymous Asiatic,’ for which *provenance* he makes interesting argument from the vocabulary (*Septuagint*, 24 ff.). This view was anticipated by Olmstead in his ‘Source Study’ (see above, §4, n. 2), arguing for an evident ‘Theodotonic’ origin of at least portions of Ki. One line of this argument lies in the occurrence of transliterations in \mathfrak{G} , an ear-mark of Theodotion. But Burney, in noting at length the transliterations in Gr. of Ki. (pp. xxviii *seq.*), finds the great majority of them only in 2 Ki., a fact that argues for different translators of the two books. A further argument for such an influence is the absence of distinct Theodotonic citations in the Hexaplaric apparatus, as observed in §4, *c*. There is to be compared C. C. Torrey’s argument for the Theodotonic origin of Gr. Chronicles (*Ezra Studies*, 1910, 66 ff.), as also the present writer’s argument for the existence of an *Ur*-Theodotion for the book of Daniel (*Comm.*, Int., §13). In the latter case the preserved Theodotonic text, actually replacing the Old Greek text

⁵ *Cf.* also Burkitt, ‘The Old Latin and the Itala,’ *TS* iv, 3 (1896), 9 ff.

in the Church's tradition of Daniel, facilitates the present argument.

With a pre-Theodotonic type of translation assumed, are we to make a like assumption for a pre-Lucianic revision? The two types are quite distinct, at least in the established characteristics of the two. Rahlfs would associate the original 'Lucian' very closely with Codex B and \mathcal{C} ; but this does not explain the marked characteristics of our Lucianic text in common with its forbears. However, Rahlfs does recognize 'vorlucianische Bestandteile' (p. 291).

The problem remains a complicated one. Alongside of Thackeray's distinction of different hands in the translation of the book, Rahlfs observes (p. 290) that by far the major difference between \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{H} exists for 1 Ki., whereas it is 'minimal' for 2 Ki. And yet the Quinta citations appear only in 2 Ki.; see §4, c. In fine, we have to assume early translation-revisions, a matter of secondary importance to the Jews, whereas the Church came to recognize the need for an authoritative text of the Bible.⁶

d. The Other Oriental Versions

For the Targum, its history and general characteristics, reference may be made to the authorities. Burney gives an exemplary list of \mathcal{T} 's exegetical variations, pp. xxx seq. It is of further interest for its exhibition, by tradition, if not by text, of the background of \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{V} .⁷ For the correspondences

⁶ In 1915 in *TSK* 88, 410 ff., Kahle advanced the view, in contradiction to de Lagarde, that the MSS of the Septuagint do not go back essentially to one archetype, but rather to numerous independent translations. This theory has been pursued by Sperber in a series of studies (e.g., 'Probleme einer Edition der Septuaginta,' *Festschrift P. Kahle* [1935], 35 ff., 'Septuagint Recensions,' *JBL* 1935, 73 ff., 'N.T. and Septuagint,' *ib.* 1940, 193 ff.), arguing for two and more early Greek translations from different Hebrew text-traditions. But as against this extravagant hypothesis see Orłinsky's art., 'On the Present Status of Proto-Septuagint Studies,' *JAOS* 1941, 81-91, and cf. review by Gehman, *JBL* 1941, 428 ff.

⁷ For discussion of the cross-relationships of \mathcal{S} see Dr., *Samuel*, pp. lxxi-lxxvi; Burn., pp. xxxii-xxxv; J. Berlinger, *Die Peschitta zum 1. (3.) Buch der Könige u. ihr Verhältnis zu Mas. Texte, LXX, u. Targum* (1897); Sperber, 'Peshitta and Onkelos,' G. A. Kohut Vol., 554 ff.; and most recently Rosenthal, *Aramaistische Forschung*, 199 ff.

common oral Targum may be postulated, as Sperber's illuminating study for the Law argues. For the comparison of the two translations of the Pentateuch he comes to the conclusion (p. 562) that \mathfrak{S} represents a form of the Targum before its later specific Rabbinic variations. The bearing of Targumic tradition upon Jerome's translation is evident, as the Notes will show.⁸

The Arabic versions of the Bible had a varied and complicated history in their origins, as observed since Pococke's day; see his study of the Arabic texts in the London Polyglot, vol. 6, and Burkitt's article cited above. Cf. Cornill's careful analysis in his Comm. on Ezekiel (1905), pp. 49 ff., proving the combination of such diverse origins for the Arabic of the Polyglots. For Daniel Gehman came to the conclusion that the "Arabic of Dan. is vastly superior to (Gr.) A, and beyond a doubt is the best representative of the (Hexaplaric) group that we now possess" (*op. cit.* in §8). But E. Rödiger, in his thorough study, *De origine et indole Arabicorum librorum V.T. historicorum interpretum* (1829), had arrived at the opposite conclusion for the Historical Books. His result is that I. 1-11 and II. 12¹⁷-25 (more particularly for exact translation) are based on the Syriac, while for I. 12-II. 12¹⁶ the Hebrew, along with Rabbinic 'commenta Judaica,' was the basis (p. 48); to wit, as in a summary section title, the Arabic version "ex Græca Alexandrina non facta est." The fault of this capable study is that the Greek used in parallelism was solely that of the *text. rec.*, without consultation of the Hexaplaric texts. \mathfrak{A} will be constantly cited below, and its constant alignment with Hexaplaric witnesses, notably A, of which it is often the

Burn. cites certain cases in which "the readings of Pesh. seem to exhibit connexion with Targ." Berlinger reaches the conclusion that dependence upon these sister-translations cannot be established, and Rosenthal, with sole reference to Onkelos, comes to no definite results. For the relation of \mathfrak{S} to \mathfrak{C} see also above, §6, n. 1.

⁸ N.b., the correct interpretation of \mathfrak{C} , I. 3¹⁷, is given by $\mathfrak{T} \mathfrak{S} \mathfrak{A} \mathfrak{V}$, as vs. the Gr.; similarly in v.²⁰ that of \mathfrak{C} by the same VSS; cf. 15⁶, etc. See S. Krauss, 'Jerome,' *JE*, esp. p. 117; and for an intensive study of another Biblical book, C. H. Gordon, 'Rabbinic Exegesis in the Bk. of Proverbs' (Univ. of Penna. Thesis), *JBL* 1930, 384 ff.; on pp. 395 ff. he exhibits for that book the parallelisms of \mathfrak{T} , \mathfrak{S} , and \mathfrak{V} .

corrector, will be adduced. But as \mathfrak{S} and the Hexapla are far more faithful to \mathfrak{H} than is \mathfrak{G} , the question of the *provenance* of \mathfrak{A} is complicated.

e. Value and Interest of the Versions

In the application of early versions to an ancient text the primary interest has been that of correcting the latter. Hence, as a rule, in such critical work on a Hebrew book selection is made of all those cases that appear to offer correction, but with the ignoring of the cases of mistranslation, through ignorance, or by artless or intentional improvement. The result has been the impression of the constant superiority of the versions, the pertinent cases of which are prominently booked. But this process of comparison does not become scientific until statistics of the right and wrong in a given version have been gathered. It will actually be found that a small percentage of the variations of the Old Greek translations, for example, have any value for text-correction. The bulk of the notable ones will be found to be in the way of interpretation, following the endeavour to obtain sense out of a passage difficult rhetorically or grammatically, or to improve it, especially when theology is involved. A modern parallel is on hand in that classic English translation, the King James Bible, in which the sense is often eked out with the very honest interpolation of italicized passages, or the ambiguity of a passage indicated by a marginal note introduced with an 'Or.' Even the very strict Jewish Version of our own day has had perforce to introduce bracketed words to make sense, and at times fails to translate literally, but makes improvement (*cf.* Preface, p. x). These cases are no guarantee of a better original text; the translators, as interpreters, had perforce to make sense, that "he who runs may read." Such variations also appear automatically in the Hebrew MSS. *Cf.* the writer's similar statement in his *Daniel*, Int., §18, 'Method and Use of the Textual Apparatus.'

Accordingly in the textual Notes of this volume constant citation of the variants of the Versions will be given, not only for their value for text-correction, a small minimum indeed, but as exhibits, at times of their misunderstanding, at times

of their honest effort to make sense out of nonsense, and to correct what appeared objectionable. The former objective will have comparatively small gains; the latter will afford a study in the interpretation attempted by the version in question, and this has an interest in itself, minor though that interest be.⁹

IV. THE SOURCES OF THE BOOK

§12. COMPARISON WITH CONTEMPORARY HISTORICAL WRITING

The Hebrew history, extending from the migrations of the Bnê-Israel down into the Persian age, as contained in the Hebrew Scriptures, is the longest consecutive literary series that we possess from the ancient Near Orient. For long it was unique, the external history being eked out by Greek travellers like Herodotus and by the remains, in second-hand condition, of such native annalists as Sanchuniathon, Manetho, and Berossos.¹ The archæological unveiling of that ancient field has reversed the process of comparison; the Hebrew records of the politically petty people of Israel can now be interpreted and commented upon in the light of an unbroken series of documents covering millennia. And so to the matter-of-fact historian those fresh original documents far transcend in interest and importance the narrow scope of the Hebrew history.

It is only in the minimum that the Hebrew chronicles run

⁹ The writer refers with strong sympathy to J. Reider's study, 'The Present State of Textual Criticism of the O.T.,' *HUCA* 7 (1930), 285 ff., and H. S. Nyberg, 'Das textkritische Problem des A.T. am Hoseabuche demonstriert,' *ZAW* 1934, 24 ff., and his 'Studien zum Hoseabuche,' *Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift*, 1935, pt. 6, with the conclusion, "Zurück zum masoretischen Texte um ihn zu studieren und zu interpretieren!"

¹ For such local archives in early days may be compared the *memorabilia* of Edom in Gen. 36, especially the succession of nine kings "before there reigned a king over the Bnê-Israel" (vv. 31ff.). For the early spread of writing in Transjordan, cf. Jud. 8¹⁴, and for the subject at large see J. W. Flight, ch. 4 of E. Grant's *Haverford Symposium*. For the authenticity and antiquity of Sanchuniathon's *Phœnician History* see Eissfeldt's *Ras Schamra u. Sanchuniathon* (as of the seventh century), and Albright, *SAC* 242 ff. ('seventh or sixth century').

pari passu with those of the great Empires. Annalistic items drawn directly or indirectly from official records are manifest from David's reign and on, but they play a small part and are a side-issue in comparison with the corresponding elements galore in the new discoveries, which abundantly illustrate the praxis. But the unique development of Hebrew history lies in its passage from the purely archival form, the digests by curious scribes of the past records of their peoples, to the Historical Story. This may extend all the way from the narrative of contemporaries, like the David-Solomon story (2 Sam. 16-1 Ki. 2), to such midrash as appears in I. 13. But in this unique development the annalistic programme has been developed into History. A new factor has been introduced, the subjective one of the eye and mind of the historian. Critics may naturally suspect sources dubbed as Prophetic, Deuteronomic, Priestly, but all real history is the result of digestion by the historian, one-sided as the emphasis must be; this is true of Thucydides, Livy, Gibbon, Macaulay, and so through the list of great historians. The criticism we should exercise is of the kind generally applied to, we may say, the sources of Herodotus; the monuments he had seen with his eye, stories he had heard with his ears, all through interpreters, are entirely unknown to us, and yet the historical verisimilitude of his reports is being constantly vindicated in contradiction of the earlier sceptical judgment upon him as a gullible traveller.² The Hebrew history has suffered in its treatment by critics too much from theological bias, formerly orthodox, now quite radical. Even if in our book the cycles of stories of the Sons of the Prophets, the Temple sources, the Deuteronomic editing, are all partisan, they remain of immense historical importance; for it is what a people thinks of itself, its origins and its future, that serves to make history, quite as much as the current facts. It was

² In bk. i, 8 he sums up for the dynasty of the Heraclidæ preceding Gyges of Lydia, the contemporary of Ashurbanipal, 22 generations, covering 505 years, *i.e.*, *ca.* 22 years per reign; this average corresponds closely to that of the Judæan dynasty. For the Tyrian dynasty from Hiram I and on, for 11 reigns (one of 8 months, terminated by assassination) Josephus reports, as from the Ephesian Menander, a regnal average of 16 years. *I.e.*, in both cases the figures are reasonable and are based on exact sources.

the Prophets and Priests who saved Israel's heritage for the future, and it was through them that the remains of the ancient secular chronicles were preserved.³

The recognition of the unique character of Hebrew history has been largely due in our days to the secular historian. From the field of historiography the eminent authority, J. T. Shotwell may be quoted :⁴ " No higher tribute could be paid to the historical worth of the Old Testament than the statement that, when considered upon the profane basis of human authorship, it still remains one of the greatest products in the history of History, a record of national tradition . . . which yet retains the undying charm of genuine art and the universal appeal to human interest " ; although, he adds, " not . . . a remarkable performance viewed from the standpoint of modern history." But criticism may be expressed of another statement by the same writer (p. 7, n. 6) : " The achievement of the Hebrew historians was primarily in the field of art. Although sections of the early records of the Jews are the finest narratives we possess from so early a period—far earlier than any similar product in Greece⁵—the principles of criticism which determined the text were not what we call scientific. They were not sufficiently objective." However, comparison of modern historical writing in the way of criticism of history some three millennia older is hardly to the point. And there is no reason to put such a story as that of David-Solomon, or that of Jehu's destruction of the Omrid dynasty, to name the most brilliant political narratives, in the category of art as opposed to the historical. There is no consciousness of art, no self-expression in judgment upon the history in the way of moralizing or of setting forth of theodicy (as in Herodotus, equally with the Prophets) ; if the composer was affected by the tragedy, of which he was a contemporary,

³ How much of such local lore of the Oriental lands has been preserved by the alien and inquisitive Herodotus ! Those ancient peoples never rendered it into literature, or, if they did, there was no interested tradition to preserve it. For an admirable discussion of comparison with that quarter see H. T. Fowler, ' Herodotus and the Early Hebrew Historians,' *JBL* 49 (1930), 207 ff.

⁴ *Introduction to the History of History*, 80 ; cf. H. E. Barnes, *A History of Historical Writing*, ch. 1.

⁵ Hecataeus, ca. 550 B.C., is accounted as the first Greek historian.

he leaves it to the reader to discover it for himself.⁶ Indeed such history writing, as in many cases in the Historical Books, falls properly into the class of Historical Story and is *historia* in the Latin sense of the word; see Shotwell, p. 229, where he cites Servius, the commentator on Virgil (on *Aen.*, i, 373), defining *historia* as contemporary narrative, while *annales* are records of the past. Reference is also to be made to Meyer for his brilliant section on 'Novellen und Erzählungen mit novellistischer Technik,' in his *IN* 189 ff., in which class he places the story of David and Bathsheba as the most eminent. But 'Novelle' may not be immediately rendered into English, nor is that story mere historical romance by any means.

There is almost nothing to compare with this development of Hebrew history from the records of the great Empires, with possibly one exception. For Egypt, of comparative importance are the poetic descriptions of the campaigns and glories of Thutmose III, Ramses II (on the battle at Kadesh), Merenptah.⁷ Apart from such extravagant rhetorical eulogies (*cf.* Deborah's Song in contrast!), Egypt gives us only the short 'Novelle,' at the best autobiographies like the stories of Sinuhe and Wen-amon.

With all the wealth of Babylonian-Assyrian remains we find hardly more than dynastic lists, notable events dated by royal years, citation of omens, and annals of reigns extravagantly written up.⁸ The only exception would be the genuine royal autobiography that we possess from Ashurbanipal. Citation may be made of Weber in his discussion of the historical inscriptions:⁹ " (Die bab.-ass.

⁶ *Cf.* citations of Olmstead in introduction to *Comm.* on I. 1-2 below.

⁷ Erman, *Lit. of the Anc. Egyptians*, 254 ff.; these were doubtless contemporary productions, as is known from one of them (p. 266). A scribe of Thutmose records how he "followed" the king, "beheld his victories," "recorded the victories," "putting them into writing, according to the facts" (Breasted, *HE* 312 f.). But "the priceless rolls have perished."

⁸ For the earlier material see Güterbock, 'Die historische Tradition u. ihre literarische Gestaltung bei Babyloniern u. Hethitern bis 1200.'

⁹ *Die Literatur der Babylonier u. Assyrer*, ch. 15 at length, in particular, p. 199.

Geschichtsschreibung) hat sogar zusammenfassende Geschichtswerke aus den Urkunden der Vergangenheit kompiliert, freilich nur in der trockensten Form der Tatsachenregistrierung, die ohne Rücksicht auf innere Zusammenhänge, ohne das Wesentliche gegenüber dem Gleichgültigen hervorzuheben, Zahl an Zahl, Kriegszug an Kriegszug, Herrscher an Herrscher reiht." He continues with the statement that we have nothing in that literature of the like of Hebrew history, although he appeals to the late Berossos for such a possibility. The result did not advance beyond the stage of court annals, was indeed "ein durchaus höfisches Produkt," as Meissner remarks.¹⁰ Over against this characteristic is that of the spirit of the Hebrew historians, always sitting in judgment upon royalty, most often 'anti-courtly,' from the story of Nathan the prophet down to that of Huldah the prophetess. The one feature similar in the non-Israelite field is the recognition of Fate.

Only in one quarter, and that of the non-Semitic Hittites, may a parallel be found. Güterbock, Teil 2 of his monograph cited above, expresses this judgment (p. 94): "(Die hethitische Geschichtsschreibung) hat im Neuen Reich eine Form gefunden, die nicht nur innerhalb der hethitischen, sondern in der ganz vorderasiatischen Geschichtsschreibung den höchsten Rang einnimmt: die der Annalen." With this statement may be compared that of his predecessor, A. Götze:¹¹ "Viel bedeutsamer ist es, dass bei den Hethitern zum ersten Male in der Weltgeschichte ein literarisches Genos von hoher Bedeutung in Erscheinung tritt: der literarische Bericht. Er sprengt den Rahmen trockener Annalistik. . . . Der hethitische historische Bericht versteht es in einer Weise, die erst in den Geschichtsberichten der Israeliten wieder erreicht wird, Ereignisse unter einheitlichen Gesichtspunkten rückschauend zusammenzufassen, Situationen eindrucksvoll

¹⁰ *Bab. u. Ass.*, 2, 367. For Meissner's judgment of the Babylonian and Assyrian chronicles see *ib.*, ch. 20. For collections of these chronicles, including the early king-lists of Ur, Isin, Babylon, etc., see Schrader, *KB* 2, 273 ff., vol. 3, 2d half, 143 ff.; Rogers, *CP* 199 ff.; Gressmann, *ATB* 1, 331 ff. The Bible student should acquaint himself with these precedents and parallels for Israelite historiography.

¹¹ *Hethiter, Churriter u. Assyrer* (Oslo, 1936), 72 ff.

darzustellen"; and finally, in translation: "The Hittite narrative does not serve the heroization and glorification of the king, it serves the presentation of deed and fate, is accordingly absolutely free of the mythical, is history."¹²

On the quality of Hebrew historiography may be cited opinions from unbiassed authorities. Moore in his essay on 'Die Eigenart der hebräischen Geschichtsschreibung,' p. 73, remarks, after reference to the edifying aims of the writers: "So schwer wir nun die Mangel der tendenziösen Geschichtsschreibung von dieser Seite empfinden, so müssen wir andererseits anerkennen, das in derselben der Ansatz zu einer philosophischen Geschichtsbetrachtung liegt. Die Geschichte ist nicht eine zufällige Zeitreihe von Geschehnissen, sondern eine sittliche Ordnung, die nicht allein Israel, sondern die Weltmächte, welche Gott als Werkzeuge der Strafe oder der Rettung gebraucht, in sich schliesst; die korrelativen Ideen der Einheit Gottes und der Einheit der Geschichte ergeben sich aus der sittlichen Auffassung der Geschichte." And again (p. 66) he observes: "So haben tatsächlich nur zwei Völker unabhängig von einander eine historische Literatur erzeugt, die Israeliten nämlich und einige Jahrhunderte nachher die Griechen." Similarly and contemporaneously Meyer in his essay on 'Individuality,' in his *Kleine Schriften*, remarks (p. 22): "From the point of view from which we contemplate history, the Israelite people takes by far the highest rank among the nations of the East. . . . In Israel political and social conditions combined to produce the first great action by individuality in the world" (*i.e.*, the prophets, etc.). There may be cited Eissfeldt's similar statement (p. 157 of the article just cited): "Zunächst bleibt trotz all der reichen Nachrichten [of Greece and Rome, the Orient] für weite Strecken der zwölf letzten vorchristlichen Jahrhunderte das A.T. immer noch die wichtigste Geschichtsquelle." And Schmidt observes (*op. cit.*, p. 30) upon the prophet Amos:

¹² For recent literary treatment of Hebrew historiography, with bibliographies, are to be noted Hempel, *Die altheb. Literatur*, 81 ff., 94 ff., and Eissf., *Einl.*, §5. Particular studies of the genius of this literature are to be found in H. Schmidt, *Die Geschichtsschreibung im A.T.*; H. T. Fowler, *History of the Literature of Ancient Israel*, cc. 6, 14; B. P. Church, *The Israel Saga, e.g.*, ch. 9; Eissf., 'Altertumskunde u. das A.T.'

“ Mit einem Schlage hat sich der enge Rahmen der Hof- und Stadtgeschichte zur Weltgeschichte erweitert.” The true diagnosis of this unique characteristic of Hebrew historiography has been given by Lindblom in his essay, ‘Zur Frage der Eigenart der alttest. Religion,’ pp. 134, 135: “ Durch die Erfassung Jahwes als eines Gottes der Geschichte wurde sein Wesen als persönlicher Wille so beherrschend bestimmt, dass seine Gebundenheit an die Natur grundsätzlich überwunden wurde ”; and, “ Gott ist einer, ein Gott nicht nur der Schöpfung, sondern vor allem der Geschichte. . . . ” These statements bear witness to the too little observed theologoumenon that the God of the Bible is the God of History. Israel, with its faith in its one God, who became for its theology the sole God of the universe, possessed a sense of the unity of history in its beginnings, of a divine operation in history, and more and more of a divine objective of all history. There are preserved but shattered fragments of the annals of the ancient great Empires, which never advanced to the creation of history, but Israel, petty and provincial as it was, a pawn of those Empires, preserved its historical philosophy, more simply its faith and its hope, and survived. By omens good and ill it learned that it and equally the world, in whose fate it was participant, were under the one Providence, and so history became intelligible.

§13. THE CHRONICLES

a. The Royal Secretariat. Archives of Royal Personalia

In David's court there were a Scribe and a Recorder (2 Sam. 8^{16ff.}, 20^{23ff.}), and the same two officials appear in the list of Solomon's cabinet, along with other officials of doubtless lettered attainments, one ‘Over-the-Year,’ and a ‘Priest, Royal Friend,’ not to speak of the intruded reference to ‘Sadok and Abiathar, Priests.’ See Comm., I. 4^{2ff.}. The Scribe was primarily the king's Secretary; but for his importance as the king's intimate counsellor may be compared the modern political development of the latter title. The Recorder also appears along with the Scribe on responsible duties (*e.g.*, II. 18^{18. 37}, 2 Ch. 34⁸). So the Hebrew word,

mazkîr, may best be rendered; he kept the royal 'book of records' (*sēper haz-zikrônôt*, Est. 6¹—*cf.* the divine 'Book of Remembrance,' Mal. 3¹⁶). It was his duty to keep the current records of the reign in the technically termed 'Book of the Days' (*sēper hay-yāmîm*), *i.e.*, 'diaries,' EVV 'chronicles.'¹ The royal business as well as pride required the keeping of such official journals.

By a process paralleling the development of letters in the great Empires these journals came to be extracted for their historical interest in continuous chronicles in the two Hebrew kingdoms, 'the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah,' 'of Israel' (I. 14^{19, 29}, etc.). With the development of *imperium* the royal dynasty became interested in history, and corresponding credit must be given to individual scribes who found a fertile field for their historical interest. In what form these royal chronicles were when they came into the hands of the editors of Kings we do not know; the original records of the North must have been destroyed or looted in the Assyrian conquest; like disaster must have befallen Jerusalem in its last days. By the interest of diligent scribes and for interested patrons copies must have been made in abbreviated editions, and put in circulation; it was such a copy that preserved the Northern Chronicles for the Judæan editors of Kings, brought by refugees, or obtained by Josiah's literary men in his assumption of dominion over the North. Such interest in historical letters was but the continuation of the rich literature still extant in Judges and Samuel.

Our Book of Kings drew upon official chronicles contemporaneously constructed. Earlier examples are found for the rise of the monarchy in Sam. : I. 13¹ (Saul); II. 2¹⁰ (Ishbosheth); 5^{4, 5} (David). For Solomon's reign is cited 'the Book of the Acts of Solomon' (I. 11⁴¹), which has drawn *in extenso* from official documents, as the following sub-section will show. Beginning with Rehoboam and Jeroboam there are fixed formulas for the beginning and end of each reign. The formula for the South includes the following items: the introductory synchronism with the Northern regnal datum,

¹ *Cf.* the Hellenistic *ἐφημερίδες*; Arrian refers (*Hist. Alex.*, vii, 25, 1) to the *ἐφημ. βασιλικοί* (var. *βασιλικαί*) of Alexander—exactly the Hebrew phrase.

age of king, length of reign, name of his mother; the final formula: the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah cited as the authority and for further reference, the burial of the king, name of his successor. There are variations, some due to original or scribal lapses, some to political vicissitudes. The synchronisms begin as between Abijam and Jeroboam (I. 15¹). Reference to the Chronicles is omitted only in the cases of Ahaziah and the usurping queen-mother Athaliah, and of the deposed and exiled Jehoahaz and Sedekiah. The age of the king is omitted for Abijam, Asa, Jehoiakim. The reign is stated to have been 'in Jerusalem,' following Oriental royal parlance. The mother's name is omitted in the case of Ahaz; for Josiah and his successors the local origin of the Judæan lady who became queen is given along with the naming of her father. The most frequent expression for the death and burial of the king is: "he slept with his fathers, and he was buried [or, they buried him] with his fathers"; or one or the other of the phrases alone is used. The first phrase is omitted in some cases of violent death, *e.g.*, Amon, Josiah. All the kings are said to have been buried in David's City (in Azariah's case plus 'in his sepulchre with his fathers,' II. 9²⁸), except Hezekiah, for whom no burial-place is reported (was his possible burial in his wicked son's tomb deliberately ignored?), Manasseh and Amon, who were buried in 'the garden of Uzza,' Josiah, who was buried 'in his own sepulchre.'

For the North, like formulas are given, but with fewer particulars. Reference to the Chronicles of the Kings of Israel is omitted only in the cases of Jehoram, Jehu's victim, and the exiled Hoshea. The synchronism is given in every case, except two, when the accompanying history made it unnecessary (Jeroboam I, Jehu). Baasha, Elah, Zimri, and Omri for his first six years, reigned 'in Tirsah,' Omri for his later years and his successors 'in Samaria.' The king 'slept with his fathers,' except in cases of violent death or divine judgment (Elah, Zimri, Ahaziah, Joram, Sechariah, Shallum, Pekahiah, Pekah, Hoshea). Jehoahaz, Jehoash were buried 'in Samaria'; Jeroboam II "slept with his fathers, the kings of Israel." Expression of this item is thus careful, not wilful. Cf. Driver, *Int.*, 186, Burney, pp. ix *seq.* (with full data), Skinner, p. 12.

b. Further Archival Materials

Before passing to the direct citation at length of original archives preserved in the Acts of Solomon and the Chronicles of Judah and of Israel, notice may be taken of indirect references to such material made in connexion with the final formula for the respective reign. These are indeed often particulars for which the historian would wish that the editors had given more detail.

There is citation from both series of Chronicles of the constant war between Rehoboam and Jeroboam (I. 14^{19, 30}), although the preceding story tells that a man of God had forbidden Rehoboam to fight with his 'brethren' (12^{22f.}, a prophetic sop to the national pride!). Reference is made to the Chronicles for Jehoash's "might and how he warred with Ahaziah king of Judah" (II. 14¹⁵), the source of the story given above of Jehoash's triumph over Jerusalem. There are frequent references to "the might" of a king and "how he warred" without further detail in the history: for Asa (I. 15²³), Omri (16²⁷—his vigorous reign was indeed ignored by the editors!), Jehoshaphat (22⁴⁵), Jehu (II. 10³⁴—another monarch ignored), Jehoahaz (13⁸, *cf.* v.⁵). More particular is the citation of Jeroboam II's "might, how he warred, and how he recovered Damascus and Hamath for Israel"—an otherwise unknown item in Syrian history (14²⁸, *cf.* v.²⁵). The longest postscript of such items appears for Jehoshaphat's reign: the removal of the sodomites, politics of Edom, shipping on the Red Sea (I. 22⁴⁷⁻⁵⁰). There are references of archæological interest, now approved by actual discovery: for Asa, concerning "the cities he built" (I. 15²³); for Ahab, "the ivory house that he built, and all the cities that he built" (22³⁹); for Hezekiah, "how he made the pool and the conduit, and brought water into the city" (II. 20²⁰). For the history of Zimri's conspiracy it is remarked that "the treason he wrought" was recorded in the Chronicles (I. 16²⁰), and there is similar citation for Shallum's conspiracy (II. 15¹⁵). Very personal is the item connected with the final formula for Asa, that "in his old age he was diseased in his feet" (I. 15²³), as also that for Azariah-Uzziah, that he "was a leper until the day of his death," a condition involving the regency of

his son Jotham (II. 15⁵). The citation for Manasseh's "sin that he sinned" (II. 21¹⁷) doubtless refers to his royal records of the innovations in the Temple. Cf. a similar annalistic record, I. 11⁷: "Then Solomon built a high-place for Chemosh."

Notice is next to be taken of direct citation of archival materials.² There are cases of items asyndetically listed, *e.g.*: "He finished the House" (I. 9²⁵); "Jehoshaphat made Tarshish ships," etc. (22¹⁹); "Came Pul king of Assyria," etc. (II. 15¹⁹); most often the conjunction was used, *e.g.*, "And Moab rebelled against Israel," etc. (II. 1¹). There are the exact datings by the year, thirteen such through II. 23. The most notable of these is the first one, with the dates by year and month for the inception and conclusion of the building of the Temple (I. 6³⁷. 38-7¹ is secondary). The next example is I. 14²⁵, "In the 5th year of king Rehoboam came Shishak king of Egypt," etc. (*n.b.* the latter's name and title, not the customary 'Pharaoh'). With II. 24 begins a long series of exact datings by year, month and day. Here the writer is certainly well-nigh contemporary to the story.

The original dating was often replaced with 'then,' some thirteen times; *e.g.*, I. 9²⁴, "Then (with correction of **U**, see Note) Pharaoh's daughter came up from David's City to her house. Then he built the Millo." The adverb has no reference to the context in such cases. Parallel time-expressions are: 'in that day' (I. 8⁶⁴), 'in those days' (*e.g.*, II. 10³²—three cases), 'in his days' (*e.g.*, I. 16³⁴—five cases), 'in those days' (*e.g.*, II. 10³²—three cases), 'in his days' (*e.g.*, I. 16³⁴—five cases), 'at that time' (*e.g.*, II. 16⁶—seven cases); these forms are paralleled in the Akkadian annals: 'at that time,' 'in these days,' 'in his day.' Such time-expressions accordingly are not primarily editorial, expressive of indefiniteness or ignorance, but of archival origin. Also there are six cases of the introduction of such an item with asyndetic *hû*, 'he' (*e.g.*, II. 14⁷—the Heb. pronoun is used only for emphasis); the usage presents in the third person the repeated 'I' in the Moabite Mesha's record of his buildings. Again certain grammatical laxities may be explained: *e.g.*, the frequent

² See for detail the writer's article, 'Archival Data in the Book of Kings.'

cases of alignment of historical perfects with Waw (four perfects so aligned, II. 18⁴). Some of the items are quite lapidary in form, as in records of royal building (*e.g.*, I. 9¹⁵⁻¹⁷, with expanded text), with which are to be compared similar brief records in the inscriptions of Mesha and the Syrian kings Zakar and Bar-Rkb.

The above summary accounts for isolated items of primitive origin. A mass of more extensive material is preserved for Solomon's reign, a documentary wealth corresponding to his glory, for which the *débaçle* that followed offers nothing similar. There are to be cited: the list of his court officials (I. 4²⁻⁶), and that of his administrative lieutenants over the land (4⁷⁻¹⁹); the memorandum of the daily provision for the palace (5^{2ff.}), and that of his chariotry (vv. 6. 8); from the story of the negotiations and agreement with Hiram (ch. 5), at least the exact specifications in vv. 24. 25. 27^{ff.}; the list of his royal buildings and account of their construction and furnishing (7¹⁻¹³); the later diplomatic arrangements with Hiram, most honestly recorded (9¹⁰⁻¹⁴); the list of the cities he built (vv. 15-18); a series of detached items (vv. 23-28, *cf.* 10²¹); another accumulation of such items with inserted matter (10^{14-22. 26-39}). I. 11¹⁴⁻²⁵, concerning the 'adversaries' whom "YHWH raised up against Solomon," the Edomite Hadad and the Syrian Reson, contains most authentic material, in particular the biographical notice of Hadad's fortunes in Egypt and the brief history of the *condottiere* Reson.³ For the documents bearing on the Temple and the brass work (6, 7^{13ff.}) see *c* below.

From the Chronicles of the Kingdoms we possess the following extended narratives of archival flavour. I. 15¹⁶⁻²² tells of the war between Asa of Judah and Baasha of Israel, and the interference of Tabrimmon, king of Aram, whose aid was purchased by valuables stripped from the Temple. The histories of the usurpers Baasha and Zimri (15^{27. 28}, 16^{9. 10. 15-18},

³ Stade, in *SBOT*, groups vv¹¹⁻¹³ as introduction to the anecdote; but that passage is solely introductory to the subsequent history of Jeroboam. The editor has cleverly aligned together the three 'adversaries.' This word of YHWH is not 'prophetic' in style; the Moabite Mesha similarly speak of 'Chemosh being angry with his people.' *Cf.* the recognition of the divine *sibbāh*, the 'turn' of fate, that brought about the division of the kingdom (I. 12¹⁵).

cf. v.²⁰) are authentically itemized. For the distinguished Omri, who gave his name to his land for the Assyrian historians, there are preserved merely the exact details of his rise to power and of his building of Samaria (16²¹⁻²⁴). Not much more appears for Ahab (16^{31, 32}—written up editorially; v.^{34a}, a casual item; 22³⁹); original details were replaced by the Prophetic Story. For Jehoshaphat there are summed up the relations with Edom and the Red Sea traffic (22⁴⁸⁻⁵⁰). II. 8²⁰⁻²² contains precise archival notes on the relations with Edom 'in the days of Jehoram of Judah' and the revolt of Libnah. 10^{32, 33} is an objective account of Hazael's diminution of Jehu's realm. With the reign of Jehoash we have the first long archival history for Judah: his restoration of the Temple and its finances, his capitulation to Hazael, and the conspiracy against him, with the assassins named (12⁵⁻²²—*cf.* the conspiracy against Amaziah, 14¹⁹, and the details of Sennacherib's assassination, 19³⁷, for which see the Assyrian annals). For the reign of Jehoahaz b. Jehu original elements appear in 13^{3, 5, 7}. For his son Jehoash's reign there are notes of prime value for the Syro-Palestinian history (13^{24, 25}), and for the same king a precise account of his triumph over Amaziah of Judah (14⁸⁻¹⁴—for Jehoash's proud challenge, *cf.* I. 20¹¹), as also of Amaziah's assassination by conspirators (vv.^{19, 20}), along with the postscript item, "He built Elath and restored it to Judah" (v.²²). For Jeroboam II's reign there are but two original items, reporting his success against Aram (14^{25a, 28}). For the long reign of Azariah-Uzziah we have, outside of the customary formula and editing, only the two statements, that "YHWH smote the king, so that he was a leper unto the day of his death, and he dwelt in a house apart" (although "he did what was right in YHWH's eyes"—a similar stroke also befalling another righteous king, Asa, I. 15²³), and that his son acted as regent (15⁵). The exact original details of the *finale* of Jeroboam's dynasty and of his *fainéant* successors may only be listed: 15^{10, 14, 16, 17, 19, 20, 25, 29, 30}, 17³⁻⁶, 18⁹⁻¹¹; the survival of these precious details is remarkable. Contemporary are the extensive details of the alliance of Ahaz with the Assyrian Tiglath-pileser against the combination of Pekah of Israel and Reson of Aram (16⁵⁻⁹), and the accompanying story of Ahaz's duplication of

a Damascene altar for the Temple along with other innovations (vv.¹⁰⁻¹⁸—all told without comment, and involving the priest Uriah). For the long history of Hezekiah (cc.18-20) there are a few annalistic items: 18^{4, 8} (each introduced with 'He'); vv. 13-16 (quite distinct with its curt form of the history of the surrender as over against the following long story); 19^{36, 37} (the return home of Sennacherib, his assassination by two sons, the succession of Esarhaddon). For Josiah's end there is a brief objective statement: "In his days Pharaoh-Necho king of Egypt went up against the king of Assyria to the river Euphrates, and king Josiah went against him. And he (Necho) slew him at Megiddo. And his servants carried him dead in a chariot, and brought him to Jerusalem" (23^{29, 30}). For Josiah's successors we have doubtless contemporary memoranda with exact details.⁴ There need merely to be listed these items of annalistic origin: for Jehoahaz, 23³³⁻³⁵; Jehoiakim, 24^{1-2a} (v.⁵ has the last reference to the 'Chronicles'); Jehoiachin, vv.⁷⁻¹⁷. For Sedekiah there survives an exemplary contemporary record, 24^{20b-25²¹}, with vv.¹⁵⁻¹⁷ alone an intrusion. The postscript, 25²²⁻³⁰, contains similar contemporary material.⁵

c. Temple Archives

The plan of the Temple and the accounts of its furnishing and its dedication (I. 6, 7, 8^{1-13, 62-64}), when reduced to simpler form, have been assigned by Kittel and others to a Temple source. Driver notes with approval (*Int.*, 189) similar assignments of narratives concerning the Temple (II. 11^{4ff.}, 12^{4ff.}, 16^{10ff.}, 22^{3ff.}), and so, *e.g.*, Kent more extensively (see

⁴ See note 1 of the writer's art. cited above, noting the record in Jer. 52²⁸⁻³⁰, which details the three deportations of the Jews and the figures for the victims involved, and remarking: "An exactly similar document describing the fall of a little state, preserved in the archives of a Hurrite family of about 1400 B.C., is presented by Chiera and Speiser in their 'Selected Kirkuk Documents,' *JAOS* 1927, no. 20, pp. 57 ff. See Speiser's admirable interpretation and his recognition of the correspondence with the records of the fall of the Jewish state."

⁵ Only brief notice may be made of the preservation in the book of Chronicles of like archival material, taken from sources similar to, even identical with, those of Kings. This fact is coming to be recognized, *e.g.*, by Begrich, *Chronologie*, 208 f., Eissf., *Einl.*, 602, Albr., *SAC* 208.

his critical analysis, pp. xiv *seq.*). But the construction of the Temple was wholly a royal undertaking; there is not a trace of priestly composition in these narratives, even in the account of the dedication, in which Solomon was the officiant. The Temple plan may practically be the architect's specifications; note the doubtless contemporary postscript with the exact datings for the construction (6^{37. 38})—of later origin 6¹ and 8². At the most the document may have been deposited in the temple. The story of the uprising against Athaliah in II. 11 has no specific priestly tinge; that in 12^{5ff.} contains reproach of the priests' mismanagement of the sacred funds, and similarly 16^{10ff.} is not complimentary to the priestly jurisdiction. Likewise in the story of the reformation of the Temple in II. 22, 23 king Josiah is the reformer, the priests are his servants; 'the high priest Hilkiah' (22⁴) could not interpret the Book of the Law which was found, and recourse was had to a prophetess (22¹⁴). This absence of priestly literary sources is very notable in comparison with such origins in other ancient literatures. However, the temple, as the literary centre, may well have been the natural depository of such archives.

§14. THE HISTORICAL STORY

a. Political Narratives

This section concerns materials other than the purely annalistic. Its most extensive object is the Prophetic Story, to be treated in the next sub-section. But there are narratives quite distinct from those of that quarter.

The first two chapters of the book are the conclusion of the Davidic Court History, extending from 2 Sam. 16. For its characterization see Comm., introduction to I. 1, 2. As so often happens in literary history, this early creation is the most classical; for its length and dramatic presentation it has no equal in the Historical Books. But it belongs to a literary *genre* that was early developed in Israel; for its extent comparison may be made with the story of Joseph.

One political story appears in the account of the negotiations with Hiram of Tyre (I. 5^{15ff.}). It has been built upon authentic details: Hiram's congratulations upon Solomon's accession, the memorandum on the transportation of the logs,

and the exact items quoted at length from early sources in vv.^{25, 27-32}. Two stories are presented illustrating Solomon's wisdom, that of his dream at Gibeon with the ensuing judgment between the two harlots (3^{1ff.}) and that of the Queen of Sheba's visit (10¹⁻¹³). The story of the second oracle at Gibeon (9¹⁻⁹), in which the primitive element of the 'dream' is omitted, is sample of late moralizing judgment; *cf.* a similar brief intrusion in the story of the building of the Temple (6¹¹⁻¹³).

In the Judæan history there are the following stories of early origin, historically authentic. The history of the revolt of the North under Solomon's former lieutenant Jeroboam in its original substance (I. 11^{26-28, 31}, 12¹⁻⁵) tells the political truth, that the revolt of the North was due to Solomon's heavy imposts, and that the schism came by divine fate (12^{1, 15}). The dramatic story of the uprising against the usurping foreigner Athaliah (II. 11) has all the earmarks of contemporary history, and without intrusion of a prophet. Parallel in character is the story of Josiah's reformation (II. 22, 23), when critically reduced to a simpler form. It is to be observed that these stories are the reflection of stirring events; also that, unlike the history of the North, they do not hail from schools of the Prophets. Only with Hezekiah's history do we have a long story of the kind, but this involving the canonical prophet Isaiah (II. 18-20=Is. 36-39), an early hagiographon indeed, but one including authentic details. The South was sterile in such literature in comparison with the riches of the North, but politics there was far less stirring; we find the same proportion in the narratives of Judges.

b. The Stories of the Prophets

For the North the political history was embalmed in lengthy narratives proceeding from the schools of the Sons of the Prophets. Here there is revival of the literary art that had flourished for the history of the Judges (*e.g.*, the story of Deborah and Sisera, ch. 4; of Gideon and his son Abimelek, cc. 6-9; of Jephthah, cc. 11, 12). The word 'school' is used of purpose. The Prophetic Guilds, preceding the advent of the canonical Prophets, who dissociated themselves from their predecessors (*cf.* Am. 7¹⁴, Mic. 3^{5ff.}, Dt. 18^{20ff.}, etc.),

developed as so often in the history of the rise of enthusiastic religious bodies their own letters. The assemblages of these enthusiasts included exhortation and instruction, and among their members were found scribes who were inspired to write the history of the stirring times in which their leaders were so actively engaged.¹

The longest example of this literary development appears in the Elijah cycle (I. 17-19, 21, II. 2). There follows that of

¹ See Comm. on II. 4³⁸ for the existence of a *yeshiva*, 'session,' i.e., school, in those guilds. For the literary beginnings in the Church, cf. Luke's reference to the 'many' who had 'undertaken' a history of the Gospel, while back of our Gospels lie documents difficult of critical precision, with subsequent generations producing a welter of apocryphal Gospels. In Islam there were probably written 'traditions' (*hadit*), going back to Muhammad's day; see I. Goldziher, *Muhammedanische Studien*, 2 (1890), 1 ff., e.g., p. 9.

These pre-canonical Prophets and their guilds appear currently in the Histories of Israel and the Histories of its Religion; but they take a minor place in comparison with 'the Writing Prophets' of the canon. An admirable statement on the character of these stories is given by Kittel, *GVI* 2, 186. He holds that about 800 B.C. there arose a *Profeten-geschichte*, the centre of which was Elijah with his contest against the Baal-cult. The composer of the history belonged without doubt to the Nebi'im of his day, and his composition gives room for the suggestion that in those guilds the art of popular historical composition was cultivated. However this 'suggestion' might be made more positive. Kittel also notes (p. 339, n. 2) the Greek *χρησμολόγος*, 'purveyor of oracle-stories,' as distinguished from the *χρησμοδός*, 'prophet.' *Per contra*, Stade, pref. to *SBOT*, holds that in their present form these stories are all post-exilic, "although the material in the Elijah and Elisha cycles 'may be pre-Exilic'"; but such literary scepticism is most unfounded. Of value is Gunkel's small volume, *Elias, Yahwe u. Baal* (1906), with many notes referring to similar religious phenomena in other religions. He recognizes (pp. 4 ff.) that in the Elijah stories both Saga and History are involved, and it is the historian's business to distinguish the two, although there remains a field for independent literary criticism. For a recent and comprehensive study see O. Plöger, *Die Prophetengeschichten der Samuel- u. Königsbücher* (1937), and for those early prophets at large, R. Kraetzschmar, *Prophet u. Seher im alten Israel* (1901); G. Hölscher, *Zum Ursprung des israelit. Prophetismus*, *BWAT* 13 (1913), 88 ff., and *Die Propheten* (1914); H. Junker, *Prophet u. Seher in Israel* (1928); A. Jepsen, *Nabi: soziologische Studien zur alt. Lit.* (1934). For earlier treatments see, *inter al.*, A. Kuenen, *Religion of Israel* (1874), 1, ch. 3; W. R. Smith, *Prophets of Israel* (1882), Lect. 2. For the comparative phenomena, J. G. Frazer's *Folk-Lore in the O.T.* will be referred to *ad locos*.

Elisha, entwined in the former, beginning at I. 19¹⁹ and continuing to II. 9, plus an apocryphal postscript, 13¹⁴⁻²¹. Elijah is a most mysterious figure, coming out of the unknown and even so disappearing; he figures only in dramatic events, of which the scene on Mount Carmel is the most vivid (I. 18). Elisha is a secondary figure, as is his history; but his personal life is presented, and he is the head of a community of the Sons of the Prophets. The most striking story in this cycle is that of Jehu's revolt (II. 9, 10), a brilliant political narrative, in which Elisha appears only in the preface as inceptor of the uprising. Within this complex are inserted, with historical justification, two brilliant stories, connected with otherwise unknown prophets: the history of the rout of Ben-Hadad at Aphek (I. 20), in which figures an unnamed 'prophet' or 'man of God,' along with 'sons of the prophets' (vv. 13. 28. 35); and (ch. 22) the dramatic scene of the contest of the lone prophet Micaiah (*cf.* 19¹⁰) with four hundred prophets and their named spokesman Sedekiah, the story being introductory to the ensuing vivid battle scene in which Ahab lost his life. Thus we possess a continuous series of Prophetic documents, broken only by annalistic items, extending from I. 17 to II. 10.

The remaining Prophetic Stories of the North are midrash in the current sense of the word, of dubious historical value. Such is the story of Ahijah the Shilonite and his oracle to Jeroboam (I. 11²⁹⁻³⁹, *cf.* 12¹⁵). Ch. 13 is a similar midrash, with its echo in II. 23^{17. 18}. The prophet Jehu ben Hanani is said to have uttered an oracle against the house of Baasha (I. 16^{1-4. 7. 12}). The Chronicler alleges a large number, some sixteen, of such Prophetic sources for the history of the kings (see Curtis, *Chron.*, 21). He twice uses the word 'midrash': 'the m. of the prophet Iddo' (II. 13²²), and 'the m. of the book of kings' (24²⁷).²

² The word 'midrash' is used above after the Chronicler's precedent. It was evidently an early technical literary term, which has variously concerned translators. The Grr. and \mathfrak{P} translate with 'book'; \mathfrak{S} reproduces with the corresponding *madrāshā*. Of the modern trr. GV has 'Historia,' followed by AV with 'story'; FV 'Mémoires'; RVV JV 'commentary'; Moff. and Chic. B, 'Midrash.' The word is to be explained from the semantic development of the same root ('to seek after, look up') in Arabic *darasa*, 'to read.' And there is the interesting parallel development of the Koranic verb *talā* (root *tlw*). 'to follow

§15. THE COMPILATION¹

For historical subject-matter the book falls into three divisions. (1) I. 1, 2 is a continuation of the story of David in Samuel; on this section comment is made in Comm., *ad loc.* (2) I. 3-11 gives the history of Solomon, for which 'the Book of the Acts of Solomon' is cited. The title is indefinite. It may refer to a strictly annalistic document, from which

after, coming to mean 'to read, recite.' In addition is to be remarked the Semitic background of Jesus' utterance, "Search the Scriptures" (Jn. 5³⁹, cf. 7⁵²), the original of which verb was *drš*, i.e., "Read the Scriptures." There may be compared the Latin 'legere,' 'to pick up, read,' cf. German 'lesen.' The word 'legend' indeed is etymologically something 'to be read,' and quite corresponds with 'midrash' and mediæval 'story,' as GV and AV excellently translate the word, which means a written historical story. The Old Norse word 'saga' has often been used for translation, cf. Mrs. Church's *The Israel Saga*, although that word rather referred to heroic events. On the subject of such oral tradition in the background of the O.T. see at large the recent works of Gandz and Lods, and the extensive pertinent section in the encyclopædic work of the Chadwicks, *The Growth of Literature* (these all cited in the Bibliography). This last treatment in a note on p. 642, defining 'saga' in opposition to 'legend' is to the point as for the modern use of the latter word: "A saga, at least in the early stages of its life, need not of necessity contain any unhistorical element, apart from the form (the conversations, etc.) in which it is presented." But their judgment of Biblical story suffers from maintaining a now out-moded view of earlier Higher Criticism, as when it is stated (p. 684) that the story of David "carries the history of Israel back to c. 1000 B.C., perhaps three centuries before the general use of writing for literary purposes." The authors appear to be primarily authorities in Norse legends. On the other side stands Albright's treatment of the subject in his volume, *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, in his section on 'Oral and Written Transmission of History,' pp. 33 ff., encyclopædic in brief compass with its analogies from other such origins of literary composition.

¹ Reference may only categorically be made to the Commentaries (including Burney's *Hebrew Text*, the Int.), Introductions, Dictionary articles, Histories of the Literature, cited in the Bibliography. There are to be noted in addition Benz., *Jahvist u. Elohist in den Königsbüchern* (an essay at pursuing those sources in Ki.) and Hölischer's study in the Gunkel-*Eucharisterion*. Of unique value is the vivid polychrome presentation of the sources in Stade-Haupt, *SBOT*; cf. also the critical presentations in Kittel's and Skinner's Commentaries and Kent's *SOT*. With regard to Benz.'s thesis there is to be observed Eissf.'s caution (*Einl.*, 150) that there is no clue for unravelling the possible threads continuing the sources of the Pentateuch.

the editor has drawn such materials ; but it is to be noted that the only dates given are those for the building of the temple and palace, while even the forty years of reign assigned appears to be an invented figure, like that for David's reign. Or it was a compilatory work, of what extent we may only guess. One metrical fragment appears in the citation of ' the Book of Jashar ' (8¹². 13). Kuenen regards the original work as wholly pre-Deuteronomic. The literary brilliance of the earlier Historical Story disappeared promptly under the magnificent Solomon. (3) There ensues the bulk of the book, the history of the Divided Kingdoms, I. 12-II. 17, continued with that of the surviving Judah, cc. 18-25.

An exemplary formal editing appears for the history of the Divided Kingdoms—notable, as despite the national schism, for the sense of the lasting community of the two halves of Israel. This feature is succinctly expressed by Driver (p. 189) : “ In the arrangement of the two series of kings a definite principle is followed by the compiler. When the narrative of a reign (in either series) has once been begun, it is continued to its close—even the contemporary incidents of a prophet's career, which stand in no immediate relation to public events, being included in it ; when it is ended, the reign or reigns of the other series, which are synchronized with it, are dealt with ; the reign overlapping it at the end having been completed, the compiler resumes his narrative of the first series with the reign next following, and so on.” ²

As authority for his data in each reign the editor refers to ' the Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah,' and *ditto* ' of the Kings of Israel.' In the latter case Joram and Hoshea are omitted in such listing, in the former Ahaziah, Athaliah, Jehoahaz, Jehoiachin, Sedekiah—in most cases for good reason. The extent and character of these two chronicles constitute a problem. Their minimum basis would be comparable with the Babylonian chronicles, which listed the

² Assemblage of these data is given by Kuenen, pp. 64 f., and most fully by Burney, pp. ix *seq.* For the vexed question of the originality of the synchronisms, see §16 below. For the history of the end of Judah exact dates are given, some of them in terms of Babylonian chronology. For these there was practically contemporary information that could be registered *memoriter*.

important events in a reign. The summary expression at the end of almost every reign, 'and all that he did,' or 'and all his might,' appears to make the chronicle in question a purely state document. Such annalistic records must have had their literary expansion, but the extent of this further development may only be judged from individual cases. These appear especially in the later Judæan history, as in the stories of the reform of Jehoash (II. 12), the intrusion of heathenish worship under Ahaz (II. 16), the temple-restoration and reformation under Josiah (II. 22, 23). But the great bulk of the Northern history, I. 12-II. 17, is literary story, prophetic and otherwise; for its characteristics see Burney, pp. 207 ff. It is most reasonable to suppose that the latter material came to be incorporated with the official chronicle material in Judah under the reign of Josiah. This literary interest was reflection of the revival under that king, who bravely attempted the unification of All-Israel. We have to suppose an exodus of Northern literati to Jerusalem, bringing their manuscripts with them, and contributing to the cultural renaissance of the more sterile South. There such a literary expansion appears in the one Judæan prophet-story, that of Isaiah, with the inclusion of a poetic masterpiece (II. 19, 20). The phenomenon would be a small parallel to the flight of Greek scholars to the West to escape the Turkish invasions. And the revival, equally national and religious, under Josiah has its parallel in the Reformation period in Northern Europe. This politically temporary revival had its permanent spiritual results, in religion with the Deuteronomic reform which laid the basis for later Judaism (the religion of a Book, a tradition followed by the Church), and in letters with the accumulation of ancient literary remains which produced a National History, of which Kings was the climax.

me
 —The Book is a history written with a religious theory and a practical aim. It has for subject not mere History, but the lessons of History. There is honest self-judgment in this product of Hebrew historiography. The schism of Israel from the God-ordained Davidic kingdom was due to Solomon's sins, the fall of the North to its continued defiance of the True Religion, and again the ruin of Judah to the inescapable fate deserved by Manasseh's sin. The remarkable note is that,

when all was lost, some one found the history of that tragic period worth recording as a lesson of God's discipline of his people. The spirit of the editor is fully Deuteronomistic.³ With II. 25^{22ff.} regarded as a postscript, the editor was a contemporary of Jeremiah, and, in his youth at least, of the publication of the Book found in the temple.

The book underwent its later minor revisions, as the variations in Heb. MSS and the early VSS show. But extensive interpolations are few, if any. The midrash in II. 23^{15ff.} may be a case in point. The Old Greek presents an apocryphal supplement to I. 12, of doubtless Hebrew and ancient origin. But there is, apart from minute alterations, and constant contaminations of text from Ch., no patent influence from the later schools (Levitical, Priestly) which edited the Torah. A reconstruction from that point of view produced a parallel but fortunately distinct volume, that of Chronicles, while our book remained practically untouched.

§16. THE CHRONOLOGY

Recent Literature

The classical essay at Biblical chronology is that of Eusebius in his *Chronica*. For the Biblical renaissance may be noted L. Cappel's *Chronologia Sacra*, published in the London Polygot, vol. 1, and again in Walton's *Biblicus Apparatus*. The following gives a list of recent literature bearing on the subject, with omission of reference to the pertinent Commentaries.

- ALBRIGHT, W. F. : The Seal of Eliakim and the Latest Pre-exilic History of Judah, *JBL* 1932, 77 ff.
 — A Votive Stele Erected by Ben-hadad I of Damascus to the God Melcarth, *BASOR* 87 (1942), 23-9.
 — A Third Revision of the Early Chronology of Western Asia, *BASOR* 88 (1942), 28-36.

³ Dr., *Int.*, 200 ff., and Burn., pp. xiii *seq.*, give full lists of phrases characteristic of the compiler of Ki., and their affinities with Dt. and Jer. Most recently Pfeiffer has made the statement (*Int.*, 377) that "the date of the original edition can be fixed without misgivings between Josiah's reforms in 621, based on the finding of Deuteronomy, and the destruction of Jerusalem in 586."

- ALBRIGHT, W. F. : The Chronology of the Divided Monarchy of Israel, *BASOR* 100 (1945), 16–22.
- BEGRICH, J. : *Die Chronologie der Könige von Israel u. Juda, u. die Quellen des Rahmes der Königsbücher (Beiträge zur Historischen Theologie, 3)*, 1929.
- Jesaia 14, 28–32. Ein Beitrag zur Chronologie der israelitisch-jüdischen Königszeit, *ZDMG* 86 (1932), 66 ff.
- BOSSE, A. : *Die chronologischen Systeme im A.T. u. bei Josephus*, *MVG* 1908, no. 2.
- CAH* : I, 145 ff. ; vol. 3, at end, Synchronistic Tables.
- CHAPMAN, W. J. : The Problem of Inconsequent Post-Dating in II Kings xv. 13, 17 and 23, *HUCA* 2 (1925), 57 ff.
- Palestinian Chronological Data, *ib.*, vol. 8–9 (1932), 151 ff. (with year by year table).
- CURTIS, E. L. : Chronology, *DB*.
- DE VAUX, R. : La chronologie de Hazaël et de Benhadad III, rois de Damas, *RB* 45 (1934), 512 ff.
- DEIMEL, A. : *Vet. Testamenti Chronologia*, Rome, 1912.
- FORRER, E. : *Zur Chronologie der neuassyrischen Zeit*, *MVG* 1915, no. 3.
- GEHMAN, H. S. : Chronology, *WDB* 1944.
- HÄNSLER, H. : Die bibl. Chronologie des 8 Jahrhunderts vor Chr., *Biblica*, 10 (1929), 257 ff.
- HONTHEIM, J. : Die Chronologie des 3. u. 4 Buches der Könige, *Zeits. f. kath. Theologie*, 42 (1918), 463 ff., 487 ff.
- KAMPHAUSEN, A. : *Die Chronologie der hebräischen Könige*, 1883.
- KENT, C. F. : *SOT* 492 ff., and plate after p. 199.
- KITTEL, R. : *GVI* 2, §36.
- KLEBER, A. M. : The Chronology of 3 and 4 Kings and 2 Paralipomenon, *Biblica*, 2 (1921), 3 ff., 170 ff.
- KÖNIG, E. : Kalenderfragen, *ZDMG* 1906, 606 ff.
- KREY, E. : Zur Zeitrechnung des Buches der Könige, *ZWT* 20 (1877), 404 ff.
- KUGLER, F. X. : *Von Moses bis Paulus*, 1922 (mostly devoted to the Biblical chronology and calendar, and with a section, pp. 234–300, maintaining the historical trustworthiness of Chronicles).
- LEWY, J. : *Forschungen zur alten Geschichte Vorderasiens*, *MVÄG* 29, Heft 2 (1924), 20 ff.

- LEWY, J.: *Die Chronologie d. Könige v. Israel u. Juda*, 1927.
- LÖV, G.: Das synchronistische System der Königsbücher, *ZWT* 1900, 161 ff.
- MAHLER, E.: *Handbuch der jüdischen Chronologie*, 1916 (with extensive treatment of the Jewish calendar systems, and a bibliography, pp. 629-35).
- MANGENOT, E. V.: Chronologie, Vigouroux's *DB*.
- MARTI, K.: Chronology, *EB*.
- MCCURDY, J. F.: Chronology, *JE*.
- MEYER, E.: Prinzipien der Rechnung nach Königsjahren, in his *Forschungen zur alten Geschichte*, 2 (1898), 441 ff., and *GA* 2, 274 ff.
- MORGENSTERN, J.: The Three Calendars of Ancient Israel, *HUCA* 1 (1924), 3 ff., and Added Notes, vol. 3, 77 ff.
 — Supplementary Studies, etc., *HUCA* 1935, 1 ff.
 — The New Year for Kings, *Gaster Memorial Volume* (1936), 439 ff.
 — Chronological Data of the Dynasty of Omri, *JBL* 59 (1940), 385-96.
- MOWINCKEL, S.: Die Chronologie der israelitischen u. jüdischen Könige, *Acta Or.*, 10 (1932), 161 ff.
- NICKLIN, T.: *Studies in Egyptian Chronology*, Vol. 1, 1928 (in particular a study of Manetho's Dynasties).
- ROBINSON, T. H.: *HI* 1, Add. Note, pp. 454 ff.
 — *Decline and Fall of the Hebrew Kingdoms*, 228 ff.
- ROST, P.: *KAT* 320 f.
- RUHL, F.: Die tyrische Königsliste des Menander von Ephesos, *Rheinisches Museum f. Philologie*, 48 (1898), 565 ff.
 — Die Chronologie der Könige von Israel u. Juda, *DZG* 12 (1895), 44 ff.
- ŠANDA, A.: *Comm.*, 2, 399-441.
- SELLIN, E.: *Geschichte*, 263 ff., 323 ff.
- STADE, B.: *GVI* 1, ch. 2.
- THIELE, E. R.: The Chronology of the Kings of Israel and Judah, *JNES* 3 (1944), 137-86.
- THILO, M.: *Die Chronologie des A.T.*, 1917.
 — *In welchem Jahre geschah die sogenannte syrisch-efraemitische Invasion, u. wann bestieg Hiskia den Thron?* 1918.

WELLHAUSEN, J. : Die Zeitrechnung des Buches der Könige, *JDT* 20 (1875), and in Bleek, *Einl.*⁴, 263 ff.=*Comp.*, 299 ff.

WINCKLER, H. : *KAT* 316 ff.

For the astronomy involved see G. Schiaparelli, *Die Astronomie im A.T.*, 1904, F. K. Ginzel, *Handbuch der mathematischen u. technischen Chronologie*, 3 vols., 1906-14; and for the calendars, the *Archæologies* of Benzinger, §36, Nowack, §38. Of the titles listed above, Begrich and Thilo each present four large tables with a year-by-year synchronistic chronology, Begrich's tables also schematically indicating the several dating systems he proposes. In simpler and more useful form Šanda gives such a table (2, 424-7).

Addenda

PARKER, R. A., and DUBBERSTEIN, W. H. : *Babylonian Chronology* 626 B.C.-A.D. 45, Univ. of Chicago Press, 1942; 2nd ed., 1946.

VOGELSTEIN, M. : *Biblical Chronology*. I. *The Chronology of Hezekiah and his Successors*, privately printed, Cincinnati, 1944.

— *Jeroboam II—The Rise and Fall of his Empire*, privately printed, Cincinnati, 1945.

*a. List of Regnal Terms and Synchronisms*¹

ALL-ISRAEL

- I. (1) Saul (years ?—I Sam. 13¹),
 (2) David 40 (I. 2¹¹)
 (3) Solomon 40 (I I⁴²)

JUDAH

- (4) Rehoboam 17
 (5) Abijam 3

ISRAEL

- || Jeroboam I 22 (I4^{20. 21})
 = „ 18th (I5^{1. 2})

¹ The following presentation is largely based on Begrich's exemplary lists and discussion, pp. 58 ff. Cf. also Kuenen, pp. 64 f., and Burn., pp. ix seq. In the table, which presents the Hebrew data alone, cardinal numbers indicate years of reign, ordinals equivalence with years in the parallel. A common epoch for both kingdoms exists after (19), another after (38). Further notes, mostly textual and bearing upon the VSS, are given after each period.

JUDAH	ISRAEL
(6) Asa 41	= Jeroboam I 20th (15 ⁹ . 10)
(7) „ 2d	= Nadab 2 (15 ²⁵)
(8) „ 3d	= Baasha 24 (15 ²⁸ . 33)
(9) „ 26th	= Elah 2 (16 ⁸)
(10) „ 27th	= Zimri 7 days (16 ¹⁵)
(11)	Civil war, Tibni and Omri (16 ²¹ . 22)
(12) „ 31st	= Omri 12 (16 ²³)
(13) „ 38th	= Ahab 22 (16 ²⁹)
(14) Jehoshaphat 25	= „ 4th (22 ⁴¹ . 42)
(15) „ 17th	= Ahaziah 2 (22 ⁵²)
(16) „ 18th	= Joram/Jehoram 12 (II. 3 ¹)
(17) Jehoram 8	= Joram 5th (8 ¹⁶ . 17)
(18) „ 2d	= „ (1 ¹⁷)
(19) Ahaziah 1	= „ 12th (8 ²⁵), 11th (9 ²⁹); Jehu's accession (ch. 9)

(1) An editor of Sam. inserted the later formula for introduction of a reign: "son of — years was X at his accession, and — years he reigned" (the v. is lacking in OGrr.); the second blank was filled out with 'two.' (This numeral frequently occurs in the regnal terms, and may mean an indefinite number, like English 'a couple'; see Comm. on I. 17¹².)

(2), (3). The figures appear to be round numbers in the absence of original data. Some scholars, *e.g.*, Wellh., Kamph., Stade, discover manipulation of the regnal chronology, with the object of obtaining an era of 480 years from the founding of the temple to the end of the Exile (*cf.* assertion of such a preceding era in I. 6¹); *e.g.*, Stade (*GVI* I, 80): the balance of Solomon's reign, 40-3=37+393 years of his successors + an alleged term of exile, 50, =480. See Begrich's criticism, pp. 14 f.

(4)-(19). The Judæan 95 years is paralleled with Israelite 98. The difference may be accounted for by presumption of more ante-datings in the latter longer list.

(5) Abijam's reign is increased to 6 years by OGrr., so obtaining the desiderated equivalence.

(6) OGrr., 'Jeroboam 24th' for '20th,' in consequence of the variation in (5).

(7) Gr. 246, 'Asa 3d' for '2d'; *cf.* note (4)-(19).

(8) Gr. b i c₂, 'Asa 4th' for '3d.'

(9) Ⓞ om. datum here, supplies it in 16⁶, with 'Asa 20th' for '26th' (so ㉒ Ⓞ); other Gr. variants, '28th,' '29th.'

(11) See Comm., *ad loc.*

(12) Omri is given a 12-year reign between Asa 31st and 38th=7 years, but the interval of civil war, (9)-(12) 4 years, approximately

accounts for the difference. For 'Asa 31st' Gr. N v x y, 'Asa 27th' (al. '20th,' '28th,' '29th'; *Ant.*, viii, 12, 5, '30th'); the change gives the desiderated extra years. For the chronology of the civil wars see Comm. on I. 15^{15ff.}.

(13) $\text{\textcircled{L}}$ $\text{\textcircled{L}}$, Ahab's accession in 'Jehoshaphat 2d' vs. 'Asa 38th.'

(14) 'Ahab 4th' = Gr. *in loco*; in OGr. insertion, 16^{28a}, = 'Omri 11th'; cf. the variations in (12), (13).

(14)-(19) See Notes on I. 14^{22ff.}, 22^{41ff.}, Comm. II. 17.

(15) $\text{\textcircled{L}}$, Ahaziah's accession in 'Jehoshaphat 24th,' vs. 'Jehosh. 17th.'

(16) Gr. v Joram's accession in 'Jehosh. 22d' vs. '18th'; cf. notes (12), (14).

(18) The datum bluntly contradicts the official data in (16), (17).

(19) In 8²⁵ $\text{\textcircled{L}}$ $\text{\textcircled{S}}$ correct '12th' to '11th' = 9²⁹; but the latter is an intruded statement.

JUDAH

ISRAEL

II. (20) Athaliah 6	Jehu 28 (10 ³⁶ , 11 ^{1.3})
(21) Joash 40	= ,, 7th (12 ^{1.2})
(22) ,, 23d	= Jehoahaz 17 (13 ¹)
(23) ,, 37th	= Joash 16 (13 ¹⁰)
(24) Amaziah 29	= ,, 2d (14 ^{1.2} , cf. v. 17)
(25) ,, 15th	= Jeroboam II 41 (14 ²³)
(26) Uzziah 52	= ,, 27th (15 ^{1.2})
(27) ,, 38th	= Zechariah 6 months (15 ⁸)
(28) ,, 39th	= Shallum 1 month (15 ¹³)
(29) ,, 39th	= Menahem 10 (15 ¹⁷)
(30) ,, 50th	= Pekahiah 2 (15 ²³)
(31) ,, 52d	= Pekah 20 (15 ²⁷)
(32) Jotham 16	= ,, 2d (15 ^{32.33})
(33) ,, 20th	= Hoshea (15 ³⁰)
(34) Ahaz 16	= Pekah 17th (16 ^{1.2})
(35) ,, 12th	= Hoshea 9 (17 ^{1.6})
(36) Hezekiah 29	= ,, 3d (18 ^{1.2})
(37) ,, 4th	= ,, 7th (18 ⁹)
(38) ,, 6th	= ,, 9th (18 ¹⁰)

(20) $\text{\textcircled{L}}$ has a long absurdly repetitive interpolation after 10³⁶, dating Jehu's accession in Athaliah's 2d year; see Rahlfs, SS 3, 276.

(22) *Ant.*, ix, 8, 5, 'Joash 21st' for '23d.'

(23) For 'Joash 37th,' Gr. v, '36th,' N + 15 MSS, '39th.'

(24) II. 14¹⁷ uniquely remarks that 'Amaziah survived Joash 15 years.'

(25) For 'Amaziah 15th' Gr. v, '16th.'

(26) For Uzziah's accession in 'Jeroboam 27th' Gr. v c₂, '25th.'

(27) For Zechariah in 'Azariah 38th,' N c₂ + 9 MSS, '28th.'

(28) For Shallum in 'Azariah 39th,' c₂, '28th.'

- (30) For 'Pekahiah 2,' \mathcal{G}^L '10,' N c_2 +11 MSS, the same group as in (27), '12.'
- (33) For Hoshea in 'Jotham's 20th,' \mathcal{S} '2d year' (by error).
- (34) For Ahaz in 'Pekah's 17th,' \mathcal{S} '18th.'
- (35) For 'Ahaz 12th' Gr. o, '10th,' c_2 , '14th.'
- (36) For 'Hoshea 3d,' c_2 , *Ant.*, ix, 13, 1, '4th,' v, '5th.'
- (38) For date of capture of Samaria in 'Hezekiah 6th,' c_2 , '10th,' \mathcal{C} '8th.'

Begrich's display of the various figures in Grr. and Josephus is most useful and suggestive. But there are variations of text, accidental or indeed wilful, in \mathcal{H} , while the Greek variations, innumerable as they are, most of them evident errors (*e.g.*, in codex A), are most open to question. See Mowinckel's display of evident errors in both \mathcal{H} and Grr., pp. 266 ff. Begrich insists on 'good tradition' underlying odd Greek MSS and Josephus, and makes use of their variants—some of which may indeed be proper corrections, but are nevertheless not original. No scientific result can be obtained from these odd quarters. MS c_2 (HP 127), at times in correspondence with N, and in two cases, (23) (30), in company with a larger group, goes its own way, distinct from the rest of the Lucianic group to which it belongs; but this phenomenon appears peculiarly in the complicated era, (26)–(38). Also the group HP 71, 245 (not directly cited in *OTG*) offers cases of exceptional readings, either alone or with other MSS. \mathcal{G}^L otherwise offers no variations of value.

For (20)–(38) there is between Judah and Israel disparity of 165 years minus 143=22+2 part-year terms. But external evidence of the Assyrian records rigorously demands shortening of these figures, to be corrected by the generally accepted dates, 841, accession of Jehu and of Athaliah, and 722, the fall of Samaria in Hezekiah's 6th year—*i.e.*, a lapse of 119 years. For Judah this involves a disparity of 46 years. It is notable that the reign of the usurper Athaliah is included in the royal chronology; but legally the royal heir's reign should have been dated from his father's death, so that subtraction of 6 from the overplus is to be made. The 29-year term of Amaziah is generally reduced by chronologers; *e.g.*, by discounting 13 years of previous regency; *n. b.* (24), and see *Comm. II.* 14^{1a}. Further Azariah-Uzziah's long reign of 52 years suggests scepticism; there may be double counting

with the years of his son Jotham's regency; *n. b.* the conflict of (32) and (33). Mahler and Kugler retain the figure, variously reducing Jotham's term. Lewy retains 52, for actual reign 27 years, plus 16 for Jotham's reign, plus 8 for regency (as alleged) of Ahaz. Others reduce the figure: *e.g.*, Begrich to 38 years, Kittel to 40, Robinson to 42, with various calculations of the regency, so diminishing Jotham's actual reign. Also the round figure 40 for Joash's reign (*cf.* the data for David and Solomon) arouses suspicion; we have to reckon with errors and lapses in the original documents, which were then arbitrarily corrected or filled out (*cf.* 1 Sam. 13¹). For Israel the discrepancy of some 25 years (144-119) is reduced by the Assyrian data. In the year 738 Menahem paid tribute to Shalmaneser V with resultant extent of 16 years to the fall of Samaria in 722. But the figures for his successors, Pekahiah 2, Pekah 20, Hoshea 9, make the era some 40 years plus *x* for balance of Menahem's term. The discrepancy is generally met by reducing Pekah's figure to 1 or 2 (Mahler 6, Kugler 5 or 6). The problem is further complicated by the synchronistic figures. According to (33) Hoshea became king in Jotham's 20th year—which then must be dated from the latter's accession to the regency, as he reigned only 16 years. But according to (35) Hoshea began to reign in Ahaz's 12th year; yet according to (37) (38) the Assyrian investment of Samaria occurred in Hezekiah's 4th year = Hoshea's 7th, and the capture in Hezekiah's 6th = Hoshea's 9th. *Cf.* Robinson, pp. 228 ff.

III. Judæan regnal terms. (39) Manasseh 55 years (II. 21¹). (40) Amon 2 (21¹⁹). (41) Josiah 31 (22¹). (42) Jehoahaz 3 months (23³¹). (43) Jehoiakim 11 (23³⁶). (44) Jehoiachin 3 months (24⁸). (45) Sedekiah 11 (24¹⁸).

From Hezekiah's reign to the destruction of Jerusalem, 587/586 B.C., crucial datings are given by external history. II. 18⁹ dates the taking of Samaria in Hezekiah's 6th year = 722/721 B.C.² Between these dates is a lapse of 135 years, which figure actually corresponds to that of the sum of the

² There is contradiction here with the statement, II. 18¹³, that the Assyrian invasion occurred in his 14th year; but for the secondary character of this figure see *Comm.*, *ad loc.*

above reigns: $110 + \text{Hez. } 29 - 6 = 135$, with an overplus of two quarter-year reigns. Accordingly the figuration followed the post-dating system; see *c* below.

b. The Synchronisms between the Chronicles of Judah and Israel

The regnal synchronisms have been largely disputed by modern criticism as secondary, constructed upon the given figures for the parallel reigns; so, *e.g.*, by Wellhausen in his early monograph, and Meyer, and this position is cautiously maintained by recent historians, Kittel and Robinson. But the study of Babylonian-Assyrian historical documents has produced a positive trend in the opposite direction. Of recent eminent authorities for this position may be named Begrich, Kugler, Lewy, Mowinckel. Their argument is based upon similar synchronisms from early days in Babylonian lists, cross-referencing with Assyrian regnal years.³ In view of these facts the writer's scepticism has yielded to a large extent. But considerable exceptions must be made. For the turbulent years following Jeroboam II official cross-reckoning for the Judæan dynasty must have been well-nigh impossible, as certain inner contradictions of synchronisms show. Further, in pursuance of the accepted chronological scheme Hebrew editors would have arbitrarily supplied lacking synchronisms, just as they at times made corrections, a fashion pursued galore by the Greek translators. It is on the safe side to assign to the Judæan and the early Israelite dynastic chronology prime importance, and to the synchronisms secondary value. This view is in contradiction to that of Lewy (*Chron.*, 28) and Mowinckel (*Chron.*, 172), alleging by way of argument that the former class is lacking in the similar Akkadian documents. But it is to be noted that the Hittites and the Egyptians recorded the regnal terms in their dynastic lists. The practical accuracy for the regnal terms Hezekiah-Jehoiachin has been exhibited just above.

³ *E.g.*, Chronicle B, in *KB* 2, 274 ff., 330 ff., *ATB* 1, 330 ff., *CP* 208 ff., for the reigns from Tiglath-pileser to Esarhaddon. For the 12th century six such synchronistic lists have been published by E. F. Weidner, *Die Könige von Assyrien. Neue chronologische Dokumente, MVAG* 26, Heft 2 (1921).

c. The Calculation of Regnal Terms

There is general difficulty of rendering an ancient precise date into modern chronological terms, due to the variation of New Year as between ancient systems, and as also in contrast with the modern beginning of the year. Internal conflicts appear in the ancient reckonings. In the Bab.-Ass. system the year 1 of a king did not begin until New Year in the spring; the preceding initial portion of the reign was termed *rēš sarrūtišu*, 'the beginning of his reign,' which appears to have its correspondent in the Hebrew dating of Evil-Merodach's action in II. 25²⁷, 'in the year of his becoming king' (but for this still-disputed phrase see Comm., *ad loc.*). This system of post-dating avoided legal and historical complications. If a king did not overlive New Year no date was assigned to him in the royal series (*cf.* the citation of reigns in months in the Hebrew lists). But when, by ante-dating, year 1 was reckoned as of the months between accession and New Year, there would be arithmetical doubling of that year, as the last of the predecessor and the first of the successor. This may explain the discrepancy between 95 years in the Judæan line and the 98 in the Israelite, as remarked above on nos. (4)-(19) in the List of Regnal Terms, I. For the final group, III (the Judæan line alone), as observed *ad loc.*, the era closely approximates the known terminal dates, and the post-dating system must have been used. As for the disparity of figures in group II, the civil wars in the North, the Assyrian invasions, and also the disturbances in the South interfered with chronological regularity. Various systems of unravelling the problem have been proposed in order to save the synchronisms. For the discrepancy in regal periods Mahler has found a way out by the assumption of three regency-periods in the Judæan line (pp. 286 ff.), followed by Lewy. An attempt at obtaining an understanding of the evident disorder is that of Kugler's (pp. 163 ff.). He admits the many errors, which he attributes to later recensions; according to his theory the original composer of the book without exception ante-dated the reigns, the subsequent revisers post-dated throughout, and these (he finds three) disagreed in their methods.

The most elaborate as also most complicated system is that

of Begrich. He proposes four distinct chronicle methods based upon the variations in reckoning the calendar years and the regnal terms, and in four plates, listing the years 932-727, he presents in columnar arrangement the variations of the four methods. The work is of particular value for the detailed criticism of the data; but its plan proposes an over-degree of theorization on part of the ancient writers. The contrast of ante-dating and post-dating is now generally recognized. Lewy holds (pp. 10 ff.) that the latter system came in with Azariah of Judah and Zechariah of Israel. Mowinkel (p. 179) finds it for the time after Hezekiah. Another problem lies in the beginning of the legal and regnal year. Did the royal year correspond with the ancient system dating the year from autumnal Tishri, or with the ecclesiastical year, dating from Nisan?—the Talmud recognizes four beginnings of the year for as many social and economical purposes (*cf.* "the return of the year, when kings sally forth (to battle)," 2 Sam. 11¹). Mahler holds (p. 210) that the year began in the spring throughout the history; Begrich that the regnal year began with the calendar year in autumn, with change to the spring dating in Josiah's time, which latter innovation Mowinkel denies (p. 175).⁴

d. The Synchronisms with External History

The continuous Assyrian *limu*- or eponym-lists, dating as in Roman chronology after an officer who gave his name to the year—such an official being also listed in Solomon's court—offer a few exact synchronisms with the history in Kings.⁵ For the end of the kingdom the book gives dates in Babylonian terms. As observed above, the rendering of the ancient years in terms of the modern calendar, beginning with January, is further confused by the Babylonian-Assyrian inception of

dates given
in Babylonian
terms

⁴ For similar complicated datings in the books of Maccabees see E. Bickermann, *Der Gott der Makkabäer* (1937), Beil. II. For like confusion in Eusebius's Chronicle see *DCB* 2, 353 f.

⁵ For Solomon's officer 'Over-the-Year' see *Comm.*, I. 4^{2a}. For the *limu*-list in question, giving a signal event for each year, see *KB* 1, 208 ff., *CP* 226 ff. The precision of the latter chronology is obtained from the dating of an eclipse of the sun, which occurred on June 15, 763 B.C.; see Mahler, p. 259.

the year at the spring equinox, while the Hebrews, at least down to the latter part of Judah's history, dated it in the autumn. Consequently double figures have in general to be given in corresponding modern chronology.

853. Ahab and Ben-Hadad of Damascus named in Shalmaneser III's record of the battle at Karkar; Comm., I. 16, at end.

842/841; Jehu's tribute to Shalmaneser; Comm., II. 10^{32f.}

738. Menahem's tribute to Tiglath-pileser; Comm., II. 15^{23ff.}

734-732. Ahaz's name recorded as tributary to Tiglath-pileser.

733/732. The Assyrian capture of Damascus. For these two items see Comm. II. 16^{7ff.}. Deposition of Pekah, Assyrian elevation of Hoshea to the throne; Comm. II. 15^{30ff.}

722/721 or 721/720 (Begrich). Capture of Samaria; Comm. II. 18^{9ff.}

701. Sennacherib's siege of Jerusalem; Comm. II. 18^{13ff.}

597/596; Mowinckel, 598/597. Nebuchadnezzar's conquest of Jerusalem; Comm., II. 24^{12.}

587 (Begrich, Mowinckel); 586 (Lewy). Destruction of Jerusalem; Comm., II. 24^{18ff.}

562/561 or 561/560. Restoration of Jehoiachin to favour by Evil-Merodach; Comm., II. 25^{27.}

For the additional dates for the last days of Jerusalem see Mowinckel, pp. 199 ff.; Albright, pp. 92 ff.; Morgenstern, *New Year for Kings*, 449 ff.

In addition may be listed certain regal synchronisms with international history.

Relations of Hiram of Tyre and Solomon (I. 5^{15ff.}, in the latter's 4th year; 9^{10ff.}, 'after 20 years'); Comm., I. 5^{5, 6^{1, 37.}}

A Pharaoh's daughter, wife of Solomon; Comm., I. 3^{1.}

Shishak's invasion in year 5 of Rehoboam; Comm., I. 14^{25ff.}

Jezebel, daughter of Ethbaal king of Tyre, wife of Ahab; Comm., I. 16^{31.}

Ben-Hadad of Damascus (*cf.* I. 20^{1ff.}) named in the contemporary Zakar inscription.

Ben-Hadad's successor Hazael (II. 87ⁿ.) named in the Assyrian inscription of 842 B.C., and the latter's son Bar-Hadad in the Zakar inscription.

Mesha of Moab (*cf.* II. 34ⁿ.) records the '40 years of oppression of Moab' by Omri and his sons.

Tiglath-pileser of Assyria, Rason of Aram contemporary with Ahaz of Judah, Pekah of Israel; Comm., II. 165ⁿ.

So-Seve, king of Egypt, in league with Hoshea against Assyria; Comm., II. 17⁴.

Tribute of Manasseh recorded by Ashurbanipal; Comm., II. 21, introd.

Invasion of Palestine by the Ethiopian Tirhakah; Comm., II. 19⁹.

The Egyptian Necho's defeat of Josiah at Megiddo, and his control of Judah; Comm., II. 23²⁹.

In addition is to be noted the unfortunately one-sided synchronism, I. 14²⁵, of Shishak's invasion of Judah in Rehoboam's 5th year; see Comm., *ad loc.* Shishak I reigned 945-924 (Breasted).

The writer foregoes adding to the detailed chronologies presented in Commentaries, histories, and the many special monographs. Omitting the early apocryphal datings for David and Solomon (each assigned 40 years), the following variants, as proposed, may be noted for the date of the accession of Rehoboam and Jeroboam I: Mahler, 953; Robinson, 936; *CAH*, Olmstead, 935; Šanda, 933; Kittel, Skinner, Winckler, 932; Mowinckel, Gehman, 931; Kugler, 929; Begrich, 926; Albright, Lewy, 922. The traditional Ussherian date is 973. The date 936 is obtained by adding the 95 years of the Judæan line in (4)-(19) above to the fixed date 841; but that assumed date should be reduced on the theory of early ante-dating.

Although we have to admit that no scheme of Chronology is perfect, it is helpful to have a table in which the kings of Israel and Judah and the events taking place in their reigns are presented in a synchronism in parallel columns. The editor accordingly has inserted at this place his Chronology, which he published in the *Westminster Dictionary of the Bible* and in the Concordance of the *Westminster Study Edition of the Holy Bible*.

I. The Period of the Hebrew Kings (about 1025 to 586 B.C.)

A. The United Kingdom.

Saul (about 1025-1010 B.C.).

David (about 1010-970 B.C.).

King of Judah 7 years and 6 months.

King of united Israel and Judah 33 years (2 Sam. 4:3).

Solomon (about 970-931 B.C.).

At the death of Solomon the kingdom was split into two independent kingdoms.

B. The Divided Kingdom.

This scheme is not offered as final in every particular, but it can be used as a working basis for the dates of the kings of Israel and Judah. Many of these dates must be considered merely as approximate. Slightly different arrangements of the data are possible at several points, but they do not affect the chronology as a whole. It would be very desirable to have a scheme consistent in all details, but with our present knowledge that is impossible. The unqualified figures in parentheses after a king's name denote the length of his reign in years. A crossline after a king's name in the Northern Kingdom or events in his reign marks a change of dynasty. The line of David ruled in unbroken succession in the Southern Kingdom except for the 6 years when Athaliah had usurped the throne (842-830 B.C.).

JUDAH, OR SOUTHERN KINGDOM

ISRAEL, OR NORTHERN KINGDOM, AND OTHER NATIONS

Reference	Ruler and Events	Year of Reign	Date B.C.	Year of Reign	Ruler and Events	Reference
I Kings 14:21	Rehoboam (17) 931-915	1	931*	1	Jeroboam (22) 931-910	I Kings 14:20
II Chron. 11:17	Three years' godliness	2		2		
I Kings 14:25	Shishak's invasion	3		3		
		4		4		
		5		5		
		6		6		
		17	915	17		
I Kings 15:1, 2 II Chron. 13:1, 2	Abijam (3) 915-912	1		18		
I Kings 15:9, 10	Asa (41) 912-871; ascends throne 1st regnal yr.	2	912	19		
		3		20		
		2	910	21		
II Chron. 14:1	Land quiet 10 yrs.	1		21 ^a	Nadab (2) 910-909	I Kings 15:25
		3		21	Baasha (24) 909-886	I Kings 15:28-33
		4		2		
		10		8		
		11		9		
II Chron. 14:9-15	War with Zerah between yrs. 11 and 14	12		10		
		13		11		
		14		12		
		15		13		
II Chron. 15:10	Reformation	16		14		
II Chron. 15:19	Buy's aid of Ben-hadad	25		23		
II Chron. 16:1, 2 } †	against Baasha	26	886	24	Elijah (2) 886-885	I Kings 16:8

I Kings 16:28a (LXX)	Jehoshaphat associated	36	876 875	10 11	I Kings 16:22, 23
II Chron. 16:12	Asa diseased	38	874	11	{ I Kings 16:29; Heb. text, 38th yr. of Asa; LXX, 2d yr. of Jehoshaphat
I Kings 22:41, 42	Jehoshaphat (25) 875-850 1st yr. of sole reign	39 40 41 42	870	2 3 4 5 6	
II Kings 8:16-26 II Chron. 21:6; 22:1, 2	Married his first-born Jehoram, to daughter of Ahab	1 2			Elijah, the prophet
		3 4 5 15 16		7 8 9 19 20	Ahab, allied with Damascus, Arabs, and others, meets Shalmaneser at Karkar (854) 853; battle indecisive
	Jehoram (Joram) associated	17 18		11 11a	I Kings 22:31
		2			Ahaziah (2) 852-850 Jehoram (Joram) (12) 850-842, perhaps associated with the government in some capacity before 850 War with Moab
		3 4 5 21	850	2 3 4	Shalmaneser at war with Damascus

* The exact date of the death of Solomon is unknown. According to different systems of chronology this event is variously dated: 945, 936, 935, 932, 931, 930, 926, 925, 922. With our present knowledge we cannot be positive, and the above chronological scheme could be modified in various places.
 In addition to references from the English Bible in the Chronology, the following have been included: LXX (the Septuagint, or the Greek version of the O.T.); Jos. Antiq. (Josephus, Jewish Antiquities); Jos. Apion (Josephus, Apion).
 † The dates 35th and 36th yr. of the reign of Asa given in these vv. in the Heb. text were explained by the older commentators as reckoned from the commencement of the Kingdom of Judah. The numbers are then correct. Modern interpreters generally regard the Heb. text as corrupt, and read 15 or 25 and 16 or 26 for 35 and 36 respectively. They are doubtless right in doing so, for the text of Chronicles has not been transmitted so carefully as it should have been, and the phrase "year of Asa," or other king, always refers to his regnal yr., and Baasha died in the 26th yr. of Asa (I Kings 16:8-10). The 15th and 16th yrs. of Asa correspond respectively to the 35th and 36th yrs. of the division of the kingdom.

Jos. *Antiq.* ix. 10, 3

				1st regnal yr.	
II Kings 14:21	Conspiracy against Amaziah (78:2)	16	784	1	
II Kings 14:21	Uzziah or Azariah , Actual reign about 782?-about 751	17		2	
II Kings 14:17	Amaziah survives Jehoash 15 yrs.	18	782	3	
II Chron. 25:25	Amaziah slain (29) and Uzziah supreme		781	4	
II Chron. 25:27, 28	Builds Elath after death of Amaziah				
II Kings 14:22	In special sense "reigns"				
II Kings 15:5	Becomes leprous and Jotham conducts the government (10) 751-730		771		
II Kings 15:32, 33			758		
			751		Amos, the prophet
				39	Hosea, the prophet
				40	Tiglath-pileser III , 716/5-728/7, king of Assyria
				41	Zachariah (6 mos.) II Kings 15:8
					II Kings 15:13
		38	745		Shallum (1 mo.)
		39			Menahem ascends (10) 744-735
		39			1st regnal yr. II Kings 15:17
II Kings 17:1	Ahaz associated Isaiah, the prophet		742		
			738		Menahem pays tribute to Pul (Tiglath-pileser) II Kings 15:19
II Kings 16:1, 2	Ahaz (16) 736-721 Micaiah, the prophet	(50)	736		
			735		Pekahiah (2) 735-734 II Kings 15:23
	Uzziah dies*	(52)	734		II Kings 15:27
					Tiglath-pileser III receives tribute from Ahaz
					Syro-Ephraimic War
					Deportation of 3½ tribes of the Northern Kingdom
					Tiglath-pileser captures Gaza
					Tiglath-pileser against Damascus
					Fall of Damascus
			733		
			732		

* "In the year that king Uzziah died" (Isa. 6:1) is often given as about 740 B.C.

† Ussher and the older chronologists assumed that anarchy prevailed for several yrs. between the death of Pekah and the accession of Hoshea. Both the Hebrew and the Assyrian records, however, clearly indicate that no interregnum occurred, but that Hoshea slew Pekah and succeeded him on the throne. The reign of 20 years causes a chronological difficulty; apparently Pekah was in authority in Galilee for 15 yrs. and reigned only 5 yrs. in Samaria.

II Chron. 33:11	Carried in chains to Babylon by the Assyrians, probably at this time	55	669	Samaria by Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal Ashurbanipal , 669-626 Invasion of Egypt (667-663) Ashurbanipal captures Babylon and dethrones (652) Shamash-shum-ukin, his brother, who had incited peoples from Elam to the Mediterranean to revolt against Assyria Receives tribute from Manassch of Judah	Ezra 4:2, 10
II Kings 21:19 II Kings 22:1 II Chron. 34:3 II Chron. 34:3 Jer. 1:1, 2 Jer. 25:1, 3 II Kings 22:23 } II Chron. 34:8 }	Armon (2) 639-638 Josiah (31) 638-608 Seeks the Lord Begins to purge nation Jeremiah begins to prophesy 13th Josiah to 4th Jehoiaikim inclusive=23 yrs. Reformation by Josiah	1 8 12 13 18	638 631 627 626 621 621 612 609	Nabopolassar , king of Chaldeans, 626-605	Fall of Nineveh Necho , king of Egypt, 609-593
II Kings 23:29 II Kings 23:31 II Kings 23:36 Jer. 25:1; 46:2 Jos. <i>Antiq.</i> x. 6, 1 }	Battle of Megiddo; death of Josiah Jehoahaz king 3 mos. Jehoiaikim (11) 608-597 He and Necho subjugated by Nebuchadnezzar	31 1 4	608 605	Battle of Carchemish (605)	Nebuchadnezzar (Nebuchadrezzar), king of Chaldeans, 605-562
Jer. 36:9 Jos. <i>Antiq.</i> x. 10, 3 } Dan. 2:1 II Kings 24:1	9th mo., public fast Jeremiah's roll burned Two yrs. after the defeat of Egypt Nebuchadnezzar dreams Having paid tribute to Neb, 3 yrs., rebels Jehoiaikim dead before surrender of Jerusalem Jehoiachin , 3 mos. Goes captive to Babylon toward close of yr. Zedekiah (11) 597-586 Visits Babylon	5 6 7 11	604 603 602	3d or 2d yr. 4th yr.	8th or 7th yr.
II Kings 24:8-12 II Chron. 36:10 } Jer. 52:28 } II Kings 24:18 Jer. 51:59	1 4	597 597 594	* Dated by many authorities in the early months of 721 B.C.		

JUDAH, OR SOUTHERN KINGDOM		ISRAEL, OR NORTHERN KINGDOM, AND OTHER NATIONS				
<i>Reference</i>	<i>Ruler and Events</i>	<i>Year of Reign</i>	<i>Date B.C.</i>	<i>Year of Reign</i>	<i>Ruler and Events</i>	<i>Reference</i>
Ezek. 1:2	Ezekiel begins to prophesy		593		Psamtik (Psammetichus) II , king of Egypt, 593-588	
II Kings 25:1	Jerusalem besieged	9	about 588		Apries (Hophra) , king of Egypt, 588-569	
Jer. 32:1		10	587		18th (or 17th) of Nebuchadnezzar	
II Kings 25:8, 9 Jer. 52:12-16, 29 Jos. <i>Antiq.</i> x. 8, 5 Jos. <i>Apion</i> i. 21	Temple burned in 5th mo.	11	586		19th (or 18th) of Nebuchadnezzar Zedekiah captured, taken to camp of Nebuchadnezzar at Riblah, where he was blinded; deported to Babylon	Ezek. 12:13
II. The Exile (586-538 B.C.)						
Jer. 52:30 Jos. <i>Antiq.</i> x. 9, 7	Captives carried to Babylon 5th yr. after destruction of Jerusalem = 23d Neb.		582/1		23d yr. of Nebuchadnezzar	
			568		Nebuchadnezzar invades Egypt in 37th yr. of his reign	
II Kings 25:27	37th yr. of Jehoiachin's captivity		562		Evil-Merodach (Amel-Marduk) , king of Chaldeans	
II Chron. 36:22, 23	Rebuilding of Temple authorized		561		Cyrus, king of Persia, takes Babylon	
Ezra 3:8 Jos. <i>Apion</i> i. 21	Rebuilding begun in 2d mo., having remained waste for 50 yrs.—that is, 49 yrs. and 9 mos.		539 538		1st yr.	
			537		2d yr.	

A COMMENTARY ON
THE BOOKS OF KINGS

COMMENTARY

I. 1-11. The regency and reign of Solomon. || 2 Ch. 1-9 ; cf. *Ant.*, viii, 1-7.

CC. 1 and 2 continue the intimate Court History of David, recorded in 2 Sam. 9-20 ; the initial conjunction expresses the connexion.¹ As a piece of literature the section stands wholly apart from the rest of Ki., is sequel to the material peculiar to Sam. The story, although evidently written by an intimate of the court, and one sharing in the popular enthusiasm for the national hero David, is by no means a royal encomium, for the writer is possessed with the sense of the tragic motive that dominated the last years of the king, the darling of Israel. That tragedy began with the taking of his neighbour's wife, Bathsheba, and his foul murder of her husband, relieved only by his affection for the child of that union, whom God took away ; there follows in dire consequence his eldest son Amnon's outrage on his half-sister, the vengeance taken upon him by Absalom, and then the latter's revolt, relieved again by the father's bitter sorrow over the death of the unfilial son. And in the present sequel we read of the court cabal which desired to raise the presumptive heir-apparent to the regency, evidently a conspiracy against the favourite queen and her son Solomon, with the sequel in the death of Adonijah and the death or disgrace of the ancient ministers, Joab and Abiathar. As the tragedy

¹ Summary reference for this Court History is made to the Commentaries on Sam. and the Introductions ; for the most recent analysis see Eissf., *Komposition der Samuelisbücher* (1931), esp. pp. 48 ff. (cf. his *Einl.*, 151 ff.), and for a recent discussion L. Waterman, "Some Historical and Literary Consequences of Probable Displacement in 1 Kings 1-2," *JAOS* 1940, 383 ff. The most elaborate treatment of the present section is that by L. Rost, *Die Überlieferung von der Thronfolge Davids* (BWANT 1926), insisting on its literary independence from the earlier narratives ; cf. Eissf.'s review, *OLz.*, 1937, 657 ff. For the political background see W. Caspari, *Thronbesteigungen u. Thronfolge der israel. Könige* (1917).

began with Bathsheba, so it ends with her figuring unwittingly in the death of the crown prince. With this culmination the story ends, without colophon, even as the origins of the narrative-source are unknown.

The story is told with fine artistry. The initial verses, detailing an apparently gossipy detail of harem history, have their *dénouement*; the anecdote of Bathsheba's and Nathan's appearance before the king (1^{15ff.}), and that of Adonijah's romance and Bathsheba's plea for him (2^{13ff.}), are brilliant pictures of Oriental court life. It is the last piece we possess of that early bloom of written historical story which had its apogee in the theme of the heroic David. All the glory of Solomon did not foster this remarkable literary development; his organization of the realm into a 'modern state' rather cut the spiritual nerve of his people, and the ensuing disruption of his kingdom shocked its proud self-consciousness. The praise of Solomon as poet and philosopher (5^{9ff.}), which record may well have historical foundation, belongs to the age of sophistication. Israel's genius lay dormant for a commensurate theme until the rise of another class of popular heroes, the Prophets, who were of the people and for the people. Apart from that material, the history of the Kingdoms is fairly commonplace. But even though little of it is great literature, the book of Kings remains as the first ordered attempt at a national history that we possess from antiquity, itself again the development of old historical saga and story.

For literary and historical appreciation of this document, citation may be made of some masters in ancient Oriental history. Wellhausen: ² "In den Hergang der Begebenheiten, die natürlichen Anlässe und menschlichen Motive der Handlungen gewinnen wir da vielfach einen recht tiefen Einblick, wengleich der Standpunkt ein beschränkt jerusalemischer ist und beispielsweise die eigentlichen Gründe des Aufstandes der Judäer unter Absalom kaum berührt werden. Die Begeisterung für David hat wol auch hier die Feder geführt, aber seine Schwächen werden nicht verschwiegen, die wenig erbaulichen Verhältnisse seines Hofes getreu berichtet, die Palastintrigue, durch die Salomo auf den Thron gelangte, mit einer beinahe boshaft scheinenden Unbefangenheit vorgetragen." Eduard

² *Prolegomena* (ed. 6), 259.

Meyer in an earlier work :³ “ Die Berichte über David lehren durch ihren Inhalt unwiderleglich, dass sie aus der Zeit der Ereignisse selbst stammen, dass ihr Erzähler über das Treiben am Hof und die Charactere und Umtriebe der handelnden Persönlichkeiten sehr genau informiert gewesen sein muss ; sie können nicht später als unter Salomo niedergeschrieben sein ” ; and later : “ Es ist etwas Erstaunliches, dass eine derartige Geschichtsliteratur damals in Israel möglich gewesen ist. Sie steht weit über allem, was wir sonst von altorientalischer Geschichtsschreibung wissen, über den trockenen offiziellen Annalen der Babylonier, Assyrer, Ägypter, über den märchenhaften Geschichten der ägyptischen Volksliteratur.” Meyer again, in his last, posthumously published work :⁴ “ Etwas ganz Überraschendes und Einzigartiges und ein Beweis für die hohe Begabung des Volks und die von ihm erreichte Höhe und Selbstständigkeit der Kultur ist aber, dass daneben hier allein im gesamten vorderen Orient eine durchaus selbstständige Geschichtsliteratur entstanden ist.” The French scholar Lods⁵ characterizes the ‘ dramas ’ in 2 Sam. 9–20, as marked “ avec une exactitude, une intensité de vie, une pénétration psychologique qui trahissent un maître historien informé par un témoin oculaire.” And finally a citation from an American historian of Oriental antiquity, Olmstead :⁶ “ Whether or not Abiathar was our historian, his work is almost a miracle to his modern successor. History such as this had never before been written. Inspired annals of a monarch’s wars, lists of kings, brief dry chronicles, folk tales of past heroes, this was the best that had been produced. Suddenly and without apparent forerunners, we have a narrative which invites comparison with many present-day accounts of a reign. The author is well informed, he knows court life from the inside, he writes simply but vividly, not for a monarch’s favour but for the instruction of generations to come. What most amazes his modern successor is his complete objectivity. . . . Our author is equally careful to trace the degeneration of David’s character under the influence of success and luxury, and the picture he paints, not by laboured description but by allowing the deeds to speak for themselves,

³ *IN* 485 f.

⁵ *Israël*, 423.

⁴ *GA* 2, pt. 2, 199.

⁶ *HPS* 337 f.

is stark tragedy, true to the dramatic facts of human nature. . . . His name may be lost, but his modern successor must pay tribute to this first and strangely modern historian of three thousand years ago."

Olmstead's attribution of 'objectivity' is so true of this composition that in spite of the critical recognition of its contemporaneity and historicity as a whole, discussion of the authorship is still rife. 1 Ch. 29²⁹ records 'the acts of Samuel the seer, of Nathan the prophet, of Gad the seer' (cf. 2 Ch. 9²⁹) as authorities for these reigns, but the citations are apocryphal. Modern scholars are inclined to attribute these court memoirs to Abiathar, David's intimate and personal priest, the partisan of Adonijah in the latter's attempt at the throne, and subsequently deposed by Solomon.⁷ But the opening of the story pictures Adonijah as a wayward youth, in terms used of his older rebellious brother Absalom; the actual items of the conspiracy are put in his adversary Nathan's mouth (1^{22ff.}), but the intention of usurpation is bluntly given in v.⁵. Whatever partisanship the author may have held—and in the strife over the succession none could have been non-partisan—he skilfully conceals his interest.⁸ The present writer agrees with Kittel (*Comm.*, and *Gesch.*, 2, 184) in coming to no solution on score of the author's identity.

Finally there is this point for the historical critic to bear in mind. With all the impressive 'objectivity' of our history it still remains impossible to determine the details of the actual facts, not to say the hidden motives, in such a story of courtly intrigue and tragedy. All that we have are contemporary stories emanating in large part from royal court and harem. What conversations went on in that secluded

⁷ So, e.g., Budde, *GAL* 86 (or to Abiathar's family), Olmstead, p. 336—at least as likely. For Abiathar's authorship might be claimed the fact that the account of his dismissal from office (2^{26. 27}) does not name his successor, as in the case of Joab (2^{35a-v.b} is a later insertion).

⁸ On the other side see Šanda's argument, pp. 49 ff., citing with approval Wellhausen's dictum on the 'fast boshaft vorkommende Aufrichtigkeit' of the author; but this reads into the story unwarranted sophistication, not found in Hebrew literature. Ehrlich presents (*Randglossen*, 213 ff.) a very sardonic view of the 'pro-Solomon conspiracy.'

circle were never known exactly outside ; current story turned objects of conversation into direct discourse—a not unknown literary art of historians. If the stories that came out of the harem were monarchical propaganda, so also anti-monarchical stories, like those of the Prophets, may equally be propaganda. We are confronted here with the historically almost un-analyzable element of the *genre* of the Historical Story, which, apart from public acts and letters, gives all we know of ancient personalities. The presumption in general for the present story is its *bona fides*. Were it not for the tragic sense that inspired the narrator, we should never have had the amount of indubitable historical fact which he incorporates.

Apart from the disputed passage, 2¹⁻⁹, the original story has been only slightly supplemented: 2¹⁰⁻¹¹, 12^b is editorial insertion of the usual data for end of a reign ; 2²⁷ is editorial comment ; 2^{35b}, not in \mathfrak{C} , is a later insertion ; 2^{46b} is a fresh title to the subsequent history. For much more radical criticism see Waterman's article cited in n. 1.

1¹⁻⁴. This very *intime* story of David's senility and the fair Abishag has its proper place in the history, and well illustrates the principle of suspense that marks Hebrew storytelling ; it prepares the way for the tragedy of Adonijah's undoing (2^{13ff.}). For Abishag's origin from Shunem and her identity, or confusion, with the Shulammite of the Song of Solomon (7¹) see Note. 2. The *ministers* (EVV *servants*), *i.e.*, gentlemen of the bedchamber (Heb., the general term *slaves*—*cf.* the honorific term $\delta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\iota$ 'Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in the N.T.), were the immediate *entourage* of the king, who had charge of his personal wants. For the many seals with the honourable title, 'minister of the king' see Comm., II. 22¹². The maiden sought was to *stand before the king*, *i.e.*, wait upon him, and *be his nurse* (so the exact tr. ; EVV *let her cherish him*, JV *be a companion unto him*), and specifically, *lie in thy bosom* (Grr., \mathfrak{T} euphemistically, *lie with him*), that the king might *keep warm*. The passage from the courtly third person to the second is elsewhere illustrated, *e.g.*, 2³⁸, 1 Sam. 25²⁸. The proposed remedy of procuring a *girl*, a *virgin* (EVV *a young virgin*), both qualities being requisite for fresh physical vigour, is correctly attributed by Josephus to 'the advice of physicians' (*Ant.*, vii, 14, 3), and this practice is corroborated by a

prescription of Galen's: " ex iis vero quæ ventri extrinsecus applicantur carnosus puellus una sic accubans, ut semper abdomen eius contingat " (*Methodus medicus*, ed. Kühn, 1821 seq., vol. 10, 7, 7; also cited by Poole); other similar prescriptions are cited by Keil (in the case of Frederick Barbarossa) and Farrar for this ancient medical practice of *γηροκομία* or *γηροβοσκία*, modern diatherapy. **3.** The search for such a maiden *in all the territory of Israel* is a bit of Oriental hyperbole. **4.** The rhetoric of the usual translation of the v., with constant repetition of *and* is to be improved; the nominal clauses at beginning and end balance one another, and together constitute the main theme: *And although the girl was very fair, and she became the king's nurse and ministered to him, yet the king was not intimate with her.* The older commentators (see Poole) argued much as to her exact relations with the king, whether as wife or concubine, even to the extent of discussing whether the impotent monarch did right in taking a woman into such a relation. But that she was simply a nurse is emphasized in this v., and is corroborated by v.¹⁵—or else another woman, even the queen mother, would not have been admitted to the chamber—and also by the latter's immediate compliance with Adonijah's application for the young lady's hand (2^{13ff.}; vs. Benzinger); certainly that experienced woman would not have been caught unawares. To be sure, Solomon chose to understand the case otherwise.

5-10. The court intrigue to elevate the heir-apparent to the regency, and its rapid development. The details of the hailing of Adonijah as king are given in Nathan's report to David (vv.^{22ff.}). Of David's elder sons (2 Sam. 3^{2ff.}) Amnon and Absalom were dead, Chileab apparently so, leaving Adonijah next in succession. **5.** *Now Adonijah, son of Haggith, exalting himself, saying, I will be king, prepared for himself chariotry and horses [see Note] and fifty outrunners.* **6.** Like his brothers Amnon and Absalom he had never been controlled by his father, and like Absalom he was *a very handsome man.* Exceptionally at this period in Hebrew history we find comments on the personal appearance of heroes: of Saul, 1 Sam. 9², of David, *ib.* 16¹². The part of personal beauty in the success of political aspirants was fully recognized by the Athenians. **7.** He obtained the support of David's old-time

priest and henchman Abiathar and of the redoubtable commander-in-chief Joab, naturally legitimists and in opposition to 'the Young Party' of the court. 8-10. To the would-be accession-festival, like its ominous precedent in Absalom's uprising (2 Sam. 15¹), he invited his brother princes except Solomon, and *all the men of Judah* [namely] *the royal ministers*; the last item indicates an attempt at securing the political interest of Judah, jealous as it was of any North Israelite interference, a jealousy which Absalom made the basis of his revolt at Hebron. (Subsequently Solomon found it necessary to constitute Judah as a royal province under his direct control; see Comm., 4¹⁹.) VV.^{8. 10} are practically parallel in naming the personalities of the opposite party, who did not join the conspiracy or were not invited. Is this a case of loose writing, or is v.⁸ with the expanded *personnel* a subsequent revision? Oddly enough *Sadok the priest*, who heads the list in v.⁸, does not appear in v.¹⁰; see Comm., 2^{35b} for the problem as to Sadok's part in the Solomonic history. For Nathan's primary concern see at vv.^{11ff.} The acme in the second list of the uninvited is Solomon's name. The two other names in v.⁸, Shimei and Rei, are unknown or textually doubtful. The regular troops (EVV *mighty men*), it is to be noted, remained loyal to the throne, and so doubtless the mercenary troops of foreign origin, whose commander was Benaiah (*cf.* 2 Sam. 8¹⁸); the generalissimo Joab appears not to have had command of these special troops, which were 'the king's own.' A military rivalry is thus attested. 9. The slaughter of *sheep and beeves and fallings* involved a sacrificial occasion, however surreptitious the occasion was; *cf.* the indirect reference to Absalom as 'offering the sacrifices' at his affair in Hebron (2 Sam. 15^{11f.}). *En-rogel*; for the identification of this spring with the modern Job's well in the Kedron valley below Jerusalem see Smith, *Jerusalem*, I, 75 ff.; Kittel, *Studien*, 150 ff.; Dalman, *Pjb.*, 1918, 47-72. This deep well strikes a subterranean stream, the drainage of the valley; see the publication of G. Dalton's account of his exploration of the shaft in 1847, published in *QS* 1922, 165 ff. For *rôgêl* Smith's identification (pp. 108 ff.) with Aram. *râgôlâ*, 'stream' is correct, *vs.* the traditional interpretation of it as 'fuller.' R. Macgregor's note on the name (*PEQ* 1938, 257 f.) is

baseless. For *the stone of Zoheleth, which is beside En-rogel*, see Smith, *l.c.*, Kittel, pp. 171 ff. ; the latter believed that he had identified the stone with a large broken block near the well. The word *zohelet* may mean 'serpent' (*cf.* Mic. 7¹⁷), and there arises the question of its identity with the Dragon Spring of Neh. 2¹³ ; Smith distinguishes them absolutely (then the latter must have disappeared), while Kittel's contemporary publication claims their identity. But Wellhausen (*Reste arab. Heidentums*, 146) compares the name with Arab. *zuhal*, 'Saturn,' and for this identification may be added the interesting support of ט, which renders the word with סכּוּתָא, *i.e.*, = סכּוּתָא, Am. 5²⁶, to be read 'Sakkuth,' *i.e.*, the Bab. Saturn. Most recently G. R. Driver has proposed (*ZAW* 1934, 51) a fresh translation as from the Arab. sense of the root, 'to roll, slip,' and the present phrase would mean 'the rolling stone.' For the modern name, Job's Well, see Kittel's argument (pp. 164 ff.) that the name of the traditional saint has replaced the older name, Joab's Well, which had come into vogue from the present history.

11-14. The hurried counsel of Nathan with Bathsheba. The prophet, adroitly speaking of the pretender as *son of Haggith*, rightly augurs the fate of the lady and her son in case of the success of the conspiracy. Arrangement is made for the dramatic presentation of the news to the king. The alleged promise on David's part of the succession of Solomon is the first statement of the royal intention on record. Accordingly the present story is easily stamped as that of a court cabal to influence the king in his dotage with the impromptu invention of such a promise ; so, *e.g.*, Benzinger, who finds Bathsheba only a 'tool' in the prophet's hand. However the present case is not without analogy in that ancient world, where queens themselves were masterful persons ; it is exemplified in Assyrian history in at least one double case. The younger son Esarhaddon was raised to the throne over elder brothers through the dominant spirit of his mother Naḫīa, Sennacherib's wife (her name indicates her West-Semitic origin), and likewise Esarhaddon's son Ashurbanipal was preferred by his father, through the grandmother's influence, over his elder brother Shamash-shum-ukin, a choice which brought on a destructive civil war ; see Meissner, *Bab. u. Ass.*,

1, 74 f.; Olmstead, *HA* ch. 30, 'Harem Intrigues for a Throne.' A similar 'harem intrigue' led by one of his wives in the last days of Ramses III in behalf of her son is recorded; see Breasted, *HE* 498 ff. For the queen-mother's influential position see Erman-Ranke, *Ägypten u. ägyptisches Leben*, 86, and for a later age Dan. 5. Subsequently the royal power, at all events in Judah, may have become constitutionalized; *n.b.* the Law of the King in Dt. 17^{14ff.}, which code insists on the prior right of inheritance for the first born son (21^{15ff.}). David's choice of Solomon as successor may well have been the result of Bathsheba's influence on her old husband. But it may have coincided with his own judgment; apart from personal sentiment there may have been good dynastic reason for preferring the Jerusalem-born son over those born at Hebron. Nathan's oracle to David (2 Sam. 7¹¹) that "YHWH will make for thee a house," *i.e.*, a dynasty, is futuritive, and critics might well regard this alleged oracle as propaganda for Solomon. With this oracle should be noted the intimate interest of the prophet in the infant Solomon, for whom he stood as sponsor, giving him a name of religious import, Jedidiah (*ib.* 12^{24f.}). For the prophet's part in the present story a parallel may be found in Assyrian history; the old Esarhaddon desired to elevate his son Siniddinapal to co-regency with him, but the omens denied him his wish; see Jastrow, *Rel. Bab. u. Ass.*, 2, 191.

15-21. Bathsheba enters the royal chamber; the repeated statement of the king's age and Abishag's presence, into which *milieu* not only the queen-mother but also Nathan was admitted (v.²²), supports the point made at v.⁴. Šanda draws the unnecessary inference that Abishag as witness to this 'conspiracy' was a possible danger to Solomon, and hence the latter had to deny Adonijah's later suit for her hand. The etiquette presented in vv.^{16. 22. 23} was that of the great empires, already adopted by the young monarchy of Israel. The queen reminds her husband of his oath to her concerning the succession, and briefly narrates Adonijah's attempt at the throne in language inspired by Nathan (*cf.* vv.^{24f.}), and concludes, *And now, here is Adonijah king!* Accordingly the king should make public pronouncement of his will, or else, if Adonijah becomes king, she and her son (a personal

argument!) will be *in default* (EVV *offenders*—a common word for ‘sinners,’ but used secularly, as at II. 18¹⁴) for treason against the throne.

22-27. Nathan enters, interrupting the queen, who forthwith retires (*cf.* v. 28); he is duly announced, for he had not the freedom of the palace as had the lady. He adroitly suggests that the king must have commanded the succession of Adonijah, or else why the pompous feast with public acclamation of him as king? But why then are those nearest to the throne, himself, Sadok, and prince Solomon, left in the dark?—again a personal thrust.

28-31. Nathan retires, and the queen is summoned again to the royal presence. The king reassures her, rehearses the oath which she had recalled to him, and promises to fulfil it *to-day*. His oath, *By YHWH who hath redeemed my soul (i.e., self, person) from all adversity*, repeats 2 Sam. 4^{9b}. The popular acclamation, *Vive le roi!* (vv. 25, 39, II. 11¹², 1 Sam. 10²⁴, 2 Sam. 16¹⁶) appears in the fuller phrase put in Bathsheba’s mouth: *Milord king David live forever!* This is a phrase not only of court etiquette but also of the mysticism enveloping the notion of royalty; see Gunkel, *Einkl. in die Psalmen*, 160, 162 ff., citing the similar extravagant expressions in Babylonian and Egyptian documents, and correctly applying them for illustration of the Royal Psalms, *e.g.*, Ps. 72^{5ff.} 17, 110⁴.

32-37. The old king arouses himself to drastic action; he summons his faithful ministers and orders them to anoint Solomon as king, giving specific instructions as to place and ceremony. The prince is to become co-regent with his father; *n.b.* the acclamation of him as ‘king Solomon’ (v. 34), and *cf.* the regency of Jotham (II. 15⁵). **33.** The formal procession for the ceremony is to include *your lord’s ministers*, who are specified at v. 38^a. The prince is to *ride on my own she-mule*, a privilege symbolizing royalty, for possession of such personal effects was sacramental guarantee; *cf.* Gen. 41⁴³, Est. 6⁸. The horse was not yet, nor for long, the mounted animal in Palestine (*n.b.* correction of ‘horsemen,’ v. 5). The mule was itself a recent innovation, being first mentioned at 2 Sam. 13²⁹, 18⁹, and this royal she-mule was probably a rarity, the mule being still object of importation (see 10²⁵), as even in later

days (Eze. 27¹⁴); the latter passage brings the animal from Beth-Togarmah in Asia Minor, even as Homer derives it from Paphlagonia and Mysia (*Il.*, ii, 852; xxiv, 277—cited by Šanda). For the mule's early existence in Babylonia, probably in the third millennium, see Meissner, *Bab. u. Ass.*, I, 219. The ass was the riding animal in the previous period; see Gen. 49¹¹, Jud. 10⁴, 12¹⁴.⁹ The ceremony was to take place at Gihon, which is identical with the Spring of the Lady Miriam (Mary) on the east slope of the Ophel; the name (meaning something like 'gusher') occurs only here and at v.³⁸, 2 Ch. 32³⁰, 33¹⁴, being replaced by that of Shiloah-Siloam, which doubtless derived its name from the tunnelled aqueduct leading from the spring to the west side of the hill. (*Cf.* II. 20²⁰, and see the literature cited above *in re* En-rogel, v.⁹).

34. The ceremony of anointing (root *māšah*) was to be performed by *Sadok the priest and Nathan the prophet*; many critics, e.g., Smend, *Lehrb. der alttest. Religionsgeschichte*, 66, Benzinger, *Stade, BH*, Eissfeldt, delete the reference to Nathan here and in the repetition at v.⁴⁵, as an interpolation, conflicting with the priestly rite appropriate only to Sadok, *cf.* v.³⁹. But this is hypercriticism; the plural pronoun (as also 'the people') frequently appears as subject of the verb 'to anoint,' e.g., 2 Sam. 2¹, 5³, below II. 11¹², 23³⁰, and even in the Chronicler, I. 29²², "they anointed him (Solomon) to be prince and Sadok to be priest." For such usage of ritual language *cf.* Amarna Tab. 37: "When Manaḥbiria, king of Egypt . . . installed my father in Nuḥašše and poured oil upon his head." For the addition of Nathan's name here it is to be remembered that Samuel who anointed David was as much seer as priest, and in II. 9 it is the prophet Elisha who sent the oil of consecration by an inferior for the inauguration of king Jehu. In the present case the actual officiant was Sadok, as v.³⁹ records. Indeed as to possible manipulation of the text we should expect that reference to the non-priestly Nathan would have been deleted, not inserted. Along with this comparatively private ceremony went the public proclamation by a herald: *Blow with the horn, and say, Long live king Solomon!*

35. *He shall come and sit upon my throne; for he shall reign*

⁹ *N.b.* the representation of the chariot drawn by four asses at Tell Agrab, published by H. Frankfort in *ILN*, Nov. 6, 1937.

in my stead, and I have appointed him to become prince over Israel and Judah. The title 'king' was used at v.³⁴; 'prince' (*nāgîd*) here reflects the early democratic objection to royalty; it is the word used in prophetic language in Sam. (I. 9¹⁶, 13¹⁴, II. 6²¹ [*cf.* v.²⁰], 7⁸) and in Ki. (I. 14⁷, 16², II. 20⁵); it is also put in the mouth of Abigail (1 Sam. 25³⁰) and of the people (2 Sam. 5²). A reflection of the contrast appears in the people's demand for a king (1 Sam. 8^{4ff.}) and Samuel's ultimate anointing of Saul as 'prince' (10¹). (The later equivalent for our word is *nāsî*, also translated 'prince' in EVV, applied to Solomon at 11³⁴, and particularly prominent in Eze.) With the presence of this archaic term there is no reason, with Stade, to regard the v. as secondary. According to v.³⁴ Solomon is to be *king over Israel*, in this v. *king over Israel and Judah*; for the former title *cf.* 4¹, 'king over all Israel,' and for the second 2 Sam. 5⁵, 12⁸. For the continued administrative distinction of Judah see Comm., 4¹⁹. **36.** The soldier Benaiah is the spokesman in loyal response, *Amen*, the earliest literary occurrence of this primarily legal formula of assent; *cf.* Num. 5²², Dt. 27^{15ff.}, and, as a reverent personal response, Jer. 11⁵. The following asseveration, as generally translated, *So say YHWH!*, is faulted with support from the Gr. by most modern commentators, except Burney and Šanda (doubtfully); see Note. But the mng. of the root 'amar, as 'to command,' as well as 'to say,' is early vouched for: 1 Sam. 16¹⁶, 2 Sam. 1¹⁸ (?), 16¹¹, 1 Ki. 11¹⁸, *cf.* Ps. 33⁹, and is supported by the same use of the root in a Zenjirli inscription, as also by current Arabic; accordingly translate: *So command YHWH!* The expression, *YHWH, the God of milord the king*, renders the ancient tenet that the Deity was peculiarly the God of the king; *cf.* the Royal Psalm, 45, v.⁸, etc. The customary address to the Pharaoh by the kings of the Amarna tablets was 'my Sun'; and there are many parallels to the present phrase in the Nabatean inscriptions (see Cooke, *NSI* no. 92). Below in v.⁴⁷ by a later piety 'thy God,' Kt., has been changed to 'God,' Kt., a change adopted by some VSS and AV JV.

38-40. The royal coup is promptly and effectively accomplished with the support of the foreign mercenaries, the *Kerêthîm* and the *Pelêthîm*, *i.e.*, Cretans and Philistines. These Peoples of the Sea, specifically the Sherdanu (the later

Sardinians), served as mercenaries in the armies of Ramses II and Ramses III; for further reff. see Note. The part that such mercenaries played in the originally quite democratic nation of Israel is not to be ignored. The sacramental consecration to kingship is effected by *the horn of oil from the Tent*; a vessel of holy oil was part of the equipment of a sanctuary and so ready for ritual uses; one was at Samuel's hand for anointing Saul and David (1 Sam. 10¹ and 16^{1, 13}, when he carried the oil-horn to Bethlehem). For this royal unction see the monograph by H. Weinel, 'מִטָּה u. seine Derivative,' *ZAW* 18 (1898), 1 ff., in particular pp. 20 ff., 52 ff. This rite made the king a holy person and so untouchable; cf. 1 Sam. 24⁷, etc. *The Tent*, more exactly 'the Tent of יְהוָה' (2²⁸), was the tent that David 'pitched' for the Ark, when he brought it to Jerusalem (2 Sam. 6¹⁷); it is magnified into the Pentateuchal Tent of Meeting at 8⁴. The herald makes proclamation with the military trumpet, the *shófār*, and the unwitting demos joins in the acclamations; such details appear again in the stories of the accession of Jehu and of Jehoash (II. 9¹³, 11¹²). For *piping with pipes* many critics adopt a correction by slight change of text, based upon the Grr., and obtain 'dancing with dances'; other VSS, 'praising in dances,' cf. Moff.; see Note. But the use of the pipe, or flute, in processions is illustrated by Is. 30²⁹, and following Thenius's criticism, dances (Heb. = round-dances) could hardly accompany a procession, particularly, it may be added, in such a terrain as that of the Ophel; Burney properly notes that the stress is laid on the noise. For the hyperbolic phrase, *the earth was rent by the noise*, Poole *cf.* similar expressions in the Classics, e.g., Virgil, "ferit æthera clamor" (*Aen.*, v, 140).

41-48. The surprise of Adonijah's party. He and his friends had finished their festive meal, which at once celebrated and concealed the real occasion, when they heard the noise from the city; it was the soldier Joab whose sharp ears detected the sound of the trumpet (so Then.). His exclamation (v. 41—literally), *Why the noise of the city in uproar?* is idiomatic enough to induce some critics to emend the text, in part taking the cue from Lucian, who did not recognize the old-fashioned word used for 'city' (see Note).

The news is brought them by Abiathar's son Jonathan, who in the past had been the faithful sleuth for his father and for David (2 Sam. 15-17). He tells the story in summary fashion—after Semitic style the terms of the earlier narrative are repeated—culminating in a startling crescendo. **46.** *And further, Solomon has taken seat on the royal throne.* **47.** *And further, the ministers came in [i.e., to his chamber] to bless our lord king David, with the words, Thy God make Solomon's name more famous than thine, and his throne greater than thy throne. And the king bowed down [in worship] upon the bed.* **48.** *And further, thus spoke the king: Blessed is YHWH, Israel's God, who has given to-day one to sit on my throne, and my eyes see it!* The session on the throne was the peak of installation. The prayerful greetings (the *blessing*) of the courtiers are extended to the elderly monarch in his bedchamber. And they flatter the father by extolling the son; Poole cites the similar sentiment in Latin writers. David prostrates himself in worship on his bed, as did Jacob (Gen. 47³¹). His response is a blessing on YHWH for his favour to him. For the accession ceremonies here described *cf.* the coronation scenes in II. 9^{11ff.}, 11^{4ff.}, and for the sentiment the Accession Psalms, *e.g.*, Ps. 72; *cf.* Mowinckel, *Psalmenstudien*, 2, 69 ff.; Gunkel, *Einl.*, §3, and for the Assyrian rites, including 'the sitting on the throne,' Meissner, *Bab. u. Ass.*, 1, 63 f. For the throne as sacramental symbol of royalty *cf.* the curse invoked in the inscription of Ahiram king of Tyre.

49. 50. The scene of the consternation and flight of Adonijah's party. **50.** The prince took sanctuary: *he caught hold of the horns of the altar*; this was the altar of the Tent of YHWH, as in 2²⁸. The horns were the most sacred part of the altar (*cf.* Am. 3¹⁴), and for their use in application of the sacrificial blood see Eze. 27², etc. There are numerous Syro-Canaanite representations of this ritual equipment; see Sellin, *Tell Ta'annek*, plates xii, xiii, and, for a large list of reproductions, Galling, *Der Altar in den Kulturen des alten Orients* (1925), plates 12, 13. See at length Cook, *The Religion of Ancient Palestine in the Light of Archæology*, 27 ff., and the later study by H. T. Obbink in *JBL* 1937, 43 ff. For the law of sanctuary *cf.* 2^{28ff.}. **51-53.** News is brought to *king Solomon*, who is now functioning with full power, that Adonijah

demands of him an oath of full indemnity before he quits sanctuary. This request is granted on condition that he behave like *a gentleman* (see Note on v.¹²); the royal ministers conduct him from the altar, and he comes and does homage to the king, who bids him to *go home*, 'a demand that he retire into private life' (Skinner).

For analysis of Lucianic variants in this ch. see Rahlfs, SS 3, §9. For the novel division in \mathfrak{S} , vv.¹⁻⁴=ch. 1, vv.^{5ff.}=ch. 2, see A. E. Silberstein, *Aquila u. Onkelos* (1931), pt. 2, 27 ff.—1. הַמֶּלֶךְ יָרָר: this order throughout 2 Sam. (exc. 13³⁹, where the text is doubtful) and in the following story, exc. at 2¹⁷, where Adonijah as an intimate puts his brother's name first; the reverse order of apposition is usual; see GK §131, g.—יָרָר: for *dāwidum*, appearing as a title in the Akk. Mari tablets, see G. Dossin, *Syria*, 1938, 109 f.—בִּימֵי בָא וּקָן בָּא בִּימֵי = Gen. 24¹, etc.; cf. בִּימֵי בָא וּקָן בָּא בִּימֵי = 1 Sam. 17¹², with correction of \mathfrak{H} ; the second predicate precises the first.—בְּנֵי־בֵד: *bed-clothes*, and so at 1 Sam. 19¹³.—יָהָם לֹא: so *BH* correctly, *vs.* יָהָם, with Mich., Bär, Ginsb.; see GK §67, p; Bergstr., *HG* 2, §27, d. The verb is impersonal, as at v.², Eccl. 4¹¹, *vs.* St., who cancels לו, forsooth because the *Grr.* appear to ignore it; but cf. similar translation idiom in EVV.—2. אֲרִי: (B† om.) *milord*, so used even when several persons speak, cf. II. 5¹³, and Aram. *Urkunden aus Assur* (1921), also similar use of Aram. בָּרִי, רָבִי, and, with Šanda, of Arab. *maulāya*.—נָעִירָה בְּתוֹלָה: Burn.'s adducing of cases like אִשָּׁה אֵלֶמְנָה is not to the point; see Note, 3¹⁶.—[הַיָּמִין] לִפְנֵי עֲבָדָה = 'wait upon,' as at 1 Sam. 16²² (cf. Dr.), etc., and so of ritual service (Dt. 10⁸, etc.), and the spiritual service of prophets (II. 5¹⁶), the verb also so used absolutely (Dan. 1⁴). Stade's elision of the passage, וְעֲבָדָה . . . כִּנְנָה (cf. alteration in \mathfrak{L}) as dependent on v.⁴ is arbitrary; *n.b.* the nice balance of the composite period.—כִּנְנָה: כִּנְנָה is an official title at Is. 22¹⁵, and so in Phoen.=Akk. *šakēnu*; \mathfrak{T} =JV, 'be a companion': Rashi, Kimchi, כִּנְנָה, 'warming': \mathfrak{S} *θαλασσοσα*, \mathfrak{V} 'fovens,' which verbs have development of mng., 'to warm' > 'to cherish,' and so with the latter the other EVV. The Jewish scholar Ibn Barun in his Grammar held to the mng., 'to warm'; see P. Wechter, *JAOS* 1941, 184, with extensive added note on the Jewish interpretations.—בְּחֵיקוֹ: *Grr.*, exc. \mathfrak{L} , euphemistically, 'with him.'—3. בָּבֵל: \mathfrak{S} \mathfrak{H} as though בָּבֵל—by variation of labial in Heb., or by the frequent confusion of *εκ* and *εψ*; see Dr., *Samuel*, p. lxxvii.—נָבִיל: 1 MS, \mathfrak{L} om.—אֲבִישָׁן: B *Αβεισα*= \mathfrak{C} ; *al.*, *Αβεισαγκ*/*α*; the second element is unknown; for the frequent fem. names with אב (as also in S. Arab.) see Noth, *IP* 15.—הַשְּׁנַמִּית: also 'הַשְּׁנַמִּית', 2^{21, 22} (so here 13 MSS); the *Kr.* is often expressed at the first occurrence of a word. Elisha's patroness was also a Shunammite, II. 4¹². The word is gentilic of יִשְׂשָׁכָר in Issachar (Josh. 19¹⁸, etc.), modern

Sōlam. For the exchange of liquids see Brock., *Grundriss*, I, 224 f., but without Heb. examples; for Heb. cf. לַחֲשִׁיׁלָהּ (and so the regional name *l's* in the Aram. Zakar inscription = *Akk. nuḫašše*, and a number of names discussed by the writer in *JAOS* 43 (1923), 50 f. For identification of the place, as old as the *Onomasticon*, see Robinson, *BR* 3, 168 ff., Guérin, *Galilée*, I, 112 ff. The relation of this Shunammite and the Shulammite of Solomon's Song is an ancient and still mooted problem. Winckler diagnosed much of the present story as mythological, David and Solomon would have mythological names, Abishag would be Ashtart (*GI* 2, 246 ff.; cf. Meyer's satirizing comment, *IN* 485, n. 1). M. Jastrow (*Song of Songs*, 1921, 217) regarded the present story as a folk-tale to celebrate the 'prize-beauties' of Shunem. With the mythological and ritual interpretation of the Song, pursued especially by T. J. Meek, 'Canticles and the Tammuz Cult,' *AJSL* 39 (1922), 39 ff., and his more developed study in W. H. Schoff's *Song of Songs, A Symposium*, 1924, pp. 48-79, there would be no reason to combine 'Shunammite' and 'Shulammite,' although Meek gives mythological explanation for the characters in the Song. Over against many fanciful solutions is that proposed by E. J. Goodspeed, 'The Shulammite,' *AJSL* 50 (1934), 102 ff., maintaining that there is no identity between the two figures, that there was no romance between Solomon and Abishag, and that 'Shulammite' of the Song is etymologically the counterpart to 'Solomon.' The discussion, with full bibliography, is well summed up by H. H. Rowley, 'The Meaning of the Shulammite,' *AJSL* 56 (1939), 84 ff.; he comes to the same conclusion as Goodspeed. But in Waterman's art. cited above in Comm., n. 1, he has presented an interpretation of the Song as a drama based upon the present story, along with some detailed literary criticism, e.g., with doubt of the name Abishag. And indeed, following the pattern of the Ugaritic comedy—which has not as yet been applied to the Song—such a drama appears to exist there, entirely fanciful with its play upon the persons of the historical story.—4. הַנְּעִירָה: MS 196 הַנְּעִירָה, cf. Ⓞ η παῖς (and so below); נְעִיר is of common gender (as is παῖς), but Ⓚr. regularly נְעִירָה for Kt. נְעִיר, when fem.—5. אֲרִינָה: so at v.¹⁸ (also on a seal, *IAE* 236), otherwise אֲרִינָה (so here Ken. 257); Ⓞ has followed Ⓜ here with Ἀδωπειας, as declinable, and yet at v.⁹ with Ἀδωπειου = אֲרִינָהוּ, B being the most faithful to the latter form of transcription; similarly (τὸν) Βεβαίου, v.⁴⁴, 2⁵⁵. It may be remarked that in such cases correction to the later form of the Heb. name was generally made at the first occurrence, the older form being often left untouched thereafter. Ⓞ has throughout the obscure transcription *Opvia*; see Rahlfs, *SS* 3, 184 f., who notes it as an ancient form, found also in B at 2 Sam. 3¹.—וּבְהַתְּשִׁיבָה: acc. to Burn., after Dr., *Tenses*, §135 (1), a ppl. of 'continuous development'; but it is to be taken as above as an introductory dependent clause.—וּבְהַתְּשִׁיבָה: cf. the form at 2 Sam. 15¹, בְּהַתְּשִׁיבָה וּבְהַתְּשִׁיבָה, but

with the collective for the first noun and a different word for 'horse.' For the present combination *cf.* the parallel in the Aram. Zakar inscription, לרבב ולפרש. All VSS translate the second word with 'horsemen,' and so all modern tr. But it means 'horses,' *i.e.*, for the chariots, as Jos. also understood it. See at length W. R. Arnold, 'The Word פרש in the O.T.,' *JBL* 24, 43 ff., denying that the word had ever the second signification as 'horsemen,' as is commonplace in Lexx., and that such a distinction occurs only in two corrupt passages in Eze.; he holds that the word was *pārāš* (not *pārāš*) = Arab. *faras* (also S. Arab.), with the proper pl. *pērāšim*. With the later development of cavalry there is to be assumed the development of the intensive for the rider (*cf.* *rakkāb*), and then the application of this vocalization throughout. For denial of Biblical references to Egyptian cavalry see Löhr, 'Aegyptische Reiterei im A.T.?' *OLz.*, 1928, 932 ff., and Albr., *AJO* 6 (1931), 159 ff., and *ARI* 135, and n. 25, the latter placing the introduction of cavalry in the Semitic world not earlier than the 9th century. Von Oppenheim has discovered reliefs of the mounted horse as of the end of the second millennium, and argues for its priority over the use of the chariot in warfare (*Der Tell Halaf*, pl. 18b, pp. 107, 133 ff.); but his dating is too early; indeed the horseman represented is without a saddle. Also according to Erman-Ranke, *Aegypten u. aegyptisches Leben*, 586, the mounted horse is not evidenced until the New Kingdom, and then as of foreign origin. The word *prš* denoted a distinct breed of the genus *sūs*. *Cf.* also the references at 5⁶, 9¹⁹, 10²⁶, 20²⁰.—6. עָבַר: 'vexed, interfered with him': Ⓜ ἀπεκάλυπεν αὐτον, hence Klost., following Grätz, would correct to עָבַר; but Ⓜ^L, ἐπετιμήσεν, corroborates Ⓜ. Jos. tr. with a doublet and other verbs. *Cf.* the Gr. plus at 2 Sam. 13²¹, of David's laxity towards Amnon, οὐκ ἐλύπησεν τὸ πνεῦμα Ἀμμών, the assumed original of which Dr. restores with the verb עָבַר. In confirmation of Ⓜ is to be noted G. R. Driver's art., 'Supposed Arabisms in the O.T.,' *JBL* 1936, 101 ff., with a long discussion of the verb from the Arabic background.—מִיָּדָיו: for partitive use of כֵּן *cf.* a case at v.⁵², and for Semitic languages, Nöld., *Syr. Gr.*, §249, c; Wright, *Arab. Gr.*, 2, 135.—יָרָה: VSS (ετεκεν, etc.) corroborate the text, exc. Ⓜ^L, εγεννησε (*cf.* Jos., and so *BH* suggests הוֹלִיר). The verb can hardly take the distant 'Haggith' as its subject; *n.b.* the circumlocutions in EVV. Burn., Benz. defend the form as impersonal, but this is hardly possible with a fem. verb (*cf.* König, *Syntax*, §324, f.). Read with St., *al.*, יָלַר; the *Kal* is used, although rarely, of male procreation, *e.g.*, Ps. 27, and so also in Ugaritic.—הָאָר: there is dispute as to the root; GB as from רָאָה, BDB as of independent root; but the former derivation is paralleled by the process הָאָר > אָרָה.—7. "His words were with Joab"; the same phrase for private dealings, conspiracy, 2 Sam. 3¹⁷.—יָעִוּרוּ אַחֲרָי: 'a pregnant construction' (Burn.), *anglice*, "they followed his

party"; cf. עונו עם חיי, 1 Ch. 12²².—8. קִרְיָ: Grr. Σαδωκ, exc \mathfrak{L} Σαδδουκ, which latter form appears in the later books, e.g., Eze., Ezra; see Schürer, *GJV* 2, 477 f., Rahlfs, *SS* 3, 184; there appear to have been artificial variations of the vocalization.—בניו: in a jar stamp, *IAE* 178.—שבע רעי: 'ש is approved by all VSS. For רעי cf. רעוא and the apocopated fem. form רעה, Palm. רעי. A number of Gr. minuscc. = \mathfrak{H} ; but B A N Pησι. \mathfrak{L} read as רעיו, 'and his friends'; Jos., 'S., David's friend,' i.e., as רעי ('David' interpolated), which Benz. accepts. Various rewritings have been proposed: ררי (1 Ch. 2¹⁴), עירא (2 Sam. 20²⁰), חרשי (1. 4²⁰), ש, 'S. the Friend,' for which court title see 4⁵—but was 'the Friend' a distinctive title? Probably S. and R. were officers of the regular troops, and it remains best, with Kit., St., to abide by \mathfrak{H} .—הנבירים: prevalent error in Grr. by corruption of οι δυνατοι (=MS e) into υιοι δυνα.—9. אבן עז: B al. μετα αιθη (=C) for μ. λιθον.—הוזהל: \mathfrak{L} Σελλαθ, for which Rahlfs argues that it was primitive here in the Gr., as also Ορνια, Σαδδουκ above. For הוזהל אבן הוזהל have 'a great stone.'—עין רגל: A M N \mathfrak{H} τ. πηγης Ρωγηλ; a₂ τ. γης P. = C; B† της P.—[אחיו] כל: B† om.—Solomon was not invited!—בני הנגל: acc. to OTG N alone of Grr. has (Rahlfs, *SS* 3, 164 finds it in \mathfrak{L}); B al. om., evidently as redundant, and so St., as taken from v.²⁵; but the phrase is titular, 'the royal princes.'—ולכל: 10 MSS Ken., deR כל ואח, and so Oort corrects; but at v.^{25f}. ל alone is used with קרא; the prepositional construction is the older idiom. There is no reason to accept Haupt's view favoured by Kit., finding in the prep. the emphatic particle *lū*.—אנש: B al., αδρους, \mathfrak{L} \mathfrak{H} ανδρας; see Thackeray, *JTS* 8, 267 f., for the former rare word as coming from his 'later translator'; it may have suggested 'gentlemen,' vs. commonplace 'men.' As vs. St.'s deletion, 'all the men of Judah' offers a pertinent political item, with the following 'royal courtiers' as an explanatory item.—10. הנביא [נתן]: \mathfrak{L} om., and so St.—For the name שלום = Σαλωμων see Montg., *JQR* 25 (1935), 263 f., for the caritative form, and so Syr. *Sheleimūn*, Arab. *Sulaimān*; without further explanation Rahlfs (*SS* 3, 184) regards the present form as a 'volkstümliche Aussprache.' The child had two names acc. to 2 Sam. 22^{7a}, the other, Jedidiah, 'beloved of Y.,' having been given by Nathan. 1 Ch. 22^{7a}. allegorizes upon the name as 'Man of Peace,' and indeed the name had political import.

11. ויאמר: \mathfrak{L} enlarges with "and he came . . . and said."—'Bathsheba': for the writer's interpretation of the name as 'daughter of the seventh day (of the week)' see *JQR* 25 (1935), 262. Cf. the fem. name 'Shabbatith,' found by Sukenik in an ossuary in the Kidron valley, *BASOR* 88 (1942), 38, and the later frequent name Shabbethai.—13. 'swear to the handmaid'; \mathfrak{L} + 'by the Lord thy God,' from v.¹⁷.—14. הנה: many MSS = VSS.—15. קִפְרָת: < *mēšārītt*, as *bat* < *bint*; similar cases cited in GK §80, d; Ugaritic parallel, *RSMT* 24.—16. ויאמר:

many MSS + לה=Ⓞ^L Ⓞ.—17. לו: Grr. om., Ⓞ Ⓞ^H have.—יהוה: Ⓞ (B a₂=Ⓞ) om.—as improper in a woman's mouth? MS 196 om. אלהיהך.—בי"א אלהיהך: 1 MS + לאמרי; Ⓞ^L simply λεγων—by haplogy?—18. ויתה 2⁰: a Sebir, ca. 250 MSS, edd. (see deR.), ואתה=VSS, correctly.—19. ולשלמה עבדך לא קרא Ⓞ^L om.—20. ואתה ca. 120 MSS, edd., ויתה=Ⓞ^L Ⓞ ו; Ⓞ^H to be retained with Kit., St. Ⓞ^L replaces והתה ארני המלך with v.^{26a}; see Rahlfs, SS 3, 175.—23. ויגירו: impers. pl.; Ⓞ *ad sensum* κ. ἀνηγγελη.—24. אמרת: the query expressed by inflection of the voice, 'thou must have said?'; cf. GK §150, l.—25. לשרי הצבא Ⓞ^L τ. ἀρχιστρατηγόν Ἰωαβ, Jos., τ. ἀρχοντα; but Nathan was adroit in naming Abiathar alone.—26. עבדך: the heir apparent was the chief 'servant of the crown'; Ⓞ^L 'thy son' is an arbitrary correction.—27. אמ ונ': for the indirect but more courteous form of question cf. GK §150, i.—עבדך Kt., עבדך K^r: the latter=all VSS; prob. preferable to keep Kt., with Kit., St.—28. והמלך ויהוה: Ⓞ Ⓞ^L om. the first noun, 2 Heb. MSS om. the second, and one om. both.—לפני המלך bis: Ⓞ Ⓞ^H ו' before the king . . . before him'; Ⓞ^L om. 1⁰; but Sem. rhetoric is repetitive.—30. כי בן . . . כי באשר: with Burn., 'the first כי introduces the subject of the oath . . . the second כי resumes the first כי . . . cf. 1 Sam. 14³⁹.'—31. ארין: vs. ארצה, v.²³, and so here Sebir, 15 MSS, Talmud (deR.); doubtless originally pronounced as terminative acc., but as lacking final ה read as absolute; the same spelling at 1 Sam. 25²³; cf. נה, נהה, 2¹⁰, 4¹.—32. והמלך 1⁰: Ⓞ^L Ⓞ om., and so St.—33. הרבנכם: for the Hif. in this sense cf. Ex. 4²⁰; see the writer's study of the root in JQR 25, 266.—אל נהיך: for many MSS Kt. על; at v.³⁸ על is used; the variation, an alternative rdg. (cf. Boström's essay), is typical of the common confusion of the two preps. in Ki. Ⓞ Ⓞ render ו' with שלומה=Ⓞ.—34. ויבשה: vs. ויבששו, v.⁴⁵; for the pl. see Comm.; St. regards the sing. as correct in both places; rather we have here the two possibilities in Sem. syntax for the number of the verb with several subjects following; argument might be made that the sing. here is secondary for distinction of Sadok.—35. ועליהם אחריו ובה: B^f om., Hex. ✕, Ⓞ has; St., *al.*, regard this as intrusion from v.⁴⁵, but such criticism is most dubious.—ואתו: read by Grr., exc. Ⓞ^L, as ואתו: for a recent study of the word see Joüon, *Biblica*, 17 (1936), 229 ff.—36. אמן בן יאמר: 3 MSS give the verb as יעשה (=Ⓞ Ⓞ), which St., Šanda accept; but this is apparently contamination from Jer. 28⁶. Grr., γενοίτο οὕτως πιστώσαι ο θεός: *i.e.*, the latter verb=אמן; accepted by Klost., Kit., Eissf., *al.*, preferred by Sk. (as it were, 'say, Amen'); but the Hif. is never used in this transitive sense. Ⓞ^L has a doublet with, "So said the Lord thy God, my lord king" (see Rahlfs, SS 3, 168, 171). Burn. properly supports Ⓞ^H. The root אמר='to command' occurs three times in the Hadad inscr., the verb possibly in line 10.—37. יהי K^r. ויהי=Ⓞ^L, a theological rectification of the jussive.—38. הכרתי והפלתו: the phrase occurs for David's bodyguard at

2 Sam. 8¹⁸, 15¹⁸, 20⁷, 20²³ (כר), 1 Ch. 18¹⁷. The Kerethites are associated with the Philistines in the latter's territory (1 Sam. 30¹⁴, Eze. 25¹⁶), and are paired with them as peoples of the sea (Zeph. 2⁴). Equation of כר with פלשת appears obvious, by absorption of *š* in *t*, and the original pronunciation is presented by Gr. Φελεθθει. The Kerethites are doubtless the Cretans, of Caphtor-Crete, Egyptian Keftiu (inclusive of the opposite Anatolian coast). The identification is supported by the Gr. tradition for כר, Zeph. 2⁸, rendered with Κρητη, while the preceding כרתם is represented with παροικοι Κρητων. The two words have mutually affected one another's pronunciation; Gr. Φελεθθει has induced Χερεθθει, while the Heb. has invented 'Pelêthi' to accord with correct 'Kerêthî'. For these Sea Peoples see Müller, *Asien u. Europa*; Breasted, *HE* cc. 21-23; F. Bilabel and A. Grohmann, *Gesch. Vorderasiens u. Ägyptens*, vol. 1 (1927); Meyer, *GA* 2, 1, 555 ff.; H. W. Parke, *Greek Mercenary Soldiers* (1933); also the pertinent article by Albr., 'A Colony of Cretan Mercenaries in the Coast of the Negeb,' *JPOS* 1 (1921), 186 ff., a study of the presence of Cretans in the south of Palestine, from which quarter David drew his mercenaries. At 2 Sam. 20²³ the Kt. is הכרי, with which is to be identified הכרי of II. 11⁴⁻¹⁹, a royal bodyguard. These latter were the Anatolian Carians, settled on the coast like the Cretans; cf. Herodotus's statement about Psammetichus's mercenaries, 'Greeks and Carians' (ii, 154); the same authority (i, 171 ff.) stresses the relations of the Carians with Crete, and relates that they were "the first who taught the weaving of crests on helmets," i.e., the Philistine head-dress. A wide perspective of the early relations of the Sea Peoples with Syria is now opened up by the Ugaritic tablets; see Schaeffer's volume, ch. 1. **Ⓣ** translates the two terms with 'bowmen and slingers' in all cases, and so here **Ⓢ** **Ⓐ**; in the other cases **Ⓢ** has אהרא פלשה ('nobles and farmers'), which is the rendering here in **Ⓢ**^H, preserving the original Syriac text. For פלתי **Ⓢ**^L has φελτι, evidently without tradition, and for כרת, χορρι, which recalls 'Horites,' but is rather to be connected with הר, 'noble,' which would explain the 'nobles' of the Syriac tradition noted above.—**39**. ויקח: the consecution is that of ideas, not of time; see Driver's extensive Observation on the question how far the consec. impf. may be temporally impf., *Tenses*, 84 ff.—**40**. והעם: of Grr. only **Ⓢ**^L has (so **Ⓢ**); **Ⓢ**^H ✕; **Ⓐ** om.—חללים בחלום: Grr., *εχορευον εν χοροισ*=חללים בחלום: this interpretation is partly followed by **Ⓣ**, reading the first word as חללים, and the second word as 'dances' (root חנן), and so **Ⓢ**^H בורא חנן, 'responsively singing in dances' (חנן=חול, Ps. 149³). But **Ⓢ** **Ⓐ**=**Ⓣ**. **Ⓢ**^L adds a doublet *ηλουν εν αυλοις*=**Ⓣ**. There was early ambiguity of interpretation; Jos. speaks (*Ant.*, vii, 14, 5) of the people as *χορευων κ. αυλοις τερπομενος*, as though=חללים בחלום. The change on basis of **Ⓢ** is accepted by some critics, e.g., Ew., St., BH, Sk.; but see Comm.—**41**. מרוע קיל הקריה הושה: **Ⓢ** **Ⓢ**^H, but treating כ' as פה;

Ⓞ^L τις βοη της φωνης ηχει μεγα, which has led St. (and so *BH fortasse*) to correct to קול התרועה הוא (cf. 1 Sam. 4¹⁴, 15¹⁴); but Šanda and Rahlfs correctly recognize that Lucian read ῥ as = קריאה (Jon. 3², cf. Is. 40³). Stade's objection to 'ב is unnecessary, nor is there contamination from v.⁴⁵. Klost., Šanda prefer ב for קול, a most unlikely corruption. The noun קריה, 'city,' is found in prose, apart from *nn. loci*, only in this narrative and in Dt. 2³⁶; the word appears in Phœn. and Ugaritic. היתה is second predicate to 'הק', cf. Song 5².—42. 'ה has the sense of Lat. 'virtus'; for the phrase cf. 1 Sam. 10²⁶, where בני היל (so read with Ⓞ) are contrasted with בני בליעל; the phrase = 'a brave fellow,' or 'gentleman,' and Šanda tr. with the latter English word at v.⁵².—43. Ⓞ om.—אבל: = 'indeed' in ironic contradiction; see Lexx. and Burney's note; cf. Arab. *bal* and *bala(y)*.—45. בנתן: see at v.³⁴; Ⓞ^L A al. (not A) have sing. verb.—בנתן: the prep. = 'at'; cf. בעין, 1 Sam. 29¹.—התם: Nif. of התם, metaplastic with התם, cf. v.⁴¹.—47. Ⓞ^L κ. εισεληλυθασι μονοι κ. εσπον; Klost. attempts explanation.—עש . . . ייב: = "give him a good name."—אלהיך: Kt. = Ⓞ^S Ⓞ^H; אלהים Kx., MSS = Grr. (ο θεος, κυριος), Ⓞ^T Ⓞ^Y; see Comm., v.³⁶.

There may be noted Swete's observation, *Int.*, 249, n. i, on Herzfeld's "careful treatment of the differences between Ⓞ and A in 3 Regn." in his *Gesch. d. Volkes Israel*, 2.

Ch. 2¹⁻⁹. This section, David's Testament, has long lain under severe criticism, historical and ethical. Against its originality as part of the narrative of cc. 1, 2 stand many critics; so Reuss, Wellhausen (*Proleg.*, 282, n. 1), Stade, Benzinger, Meyer (*GA* 2, 2, 262, n. 1); *per contra* may be named Kuenen, Driver, Cornill, Kittel (in Comm., and *GVI* 2, 243 ff.). The one concrete objection is the patently Deuteronomic character of vv.³⁻⁴ (for cross-references see Burney, Skinner). But with the reasonable excision of these vv., because of their disturbance of connexion between v.² and v.⁵, and with some textual emendations, the story may be accepted as original. V.² is a legacy of virile counsel. With the excision proposed this is followed by three definite injunctions, vv.⁵⁻⁹: to make atonement for the blood-guilt brought upon David by Joab's murders, with remembrance of the bitter days of his own flight from the throne; to pension Barzillai's family; and to find pretext for the undoing of Shimei, who had cursed him with a *baleful curse*. The ethical objection is made that the first and third of these injunctions are repellent to what we would desire to think of David's

character—a subjective enough criterion! As for the judgment upon Joab with the primitive horror before blood-guilt, an example of which David had himself exhibited in a barbarous action (2 Sam. 21), proper correction of v.⁵ exposes the king's motive with all clarity. It is a problem of psychology—a science that gives little control on history—why David did not himself take the vengeance due. More personal and petty is his proscription of Shimei, contradicting his earlier unexampled clemency towards him. Was it the rankling of an old man's mind over a once bitter enemy and his curse? If the story is a fabrication out of the whole cloth, then we have in it a narrative of baseless slander. But why a much later age (Deuteronomic) should have invented the story to save Scolomon's virtue by throwing the odium upon David is unintelligible in view of the latter's canonization. In a word, our moral judgment is not a measure for past history. And so Šanda (p. 49): “Doch sind die harten Verordnungen aus der unvollkommenen Moral der alten Zeit erklärlich.” There has been a reaction, especially on the part of historians, towards recognition of the early origin of the narratives in this ch., even if they are to be distinguished from the major story. Thus Eissfeldt (*Komposition d. Samuelisbücher*, 48 f.) holds that this section is ‘a parallel narrative,’ not ‘a secondary addition,’ even as he presents the sources of Samuel after the same fashion. Lods (*Israël*, 425) curtly dismisses the objections to the testament. Robinson (*HI* I, 244 ff.), while sceptical as to the accuracy of these records, does not ascribe a late origin to them. Olmstead (*HPS* 335) suggests that the present story with its sequel had Nathan for its author. But why then the inclusion of the unimportant Barzillites, and why no word of warning about Adonijah? As argued in the introduction to these cc., we are dealing with the *genre* of the ‘historical story,’ in this case a tale which came out of the inner court. The historian is justified in the position that so the record reads, and that we have not the means of exploring its ultimate truth.

2. *I am going the way of all the earth*: cf. Jos. 23¹⁴, Eccl. 3²⁰, etc. Poole *cf.* similar Classical sentiments, e.g., “Omnium idem exitus, sed est idem domicilium,” from Petronius, *Satyricon*. *Be strong and play the man* (EVV *show thyself a man*):

a veritable soldier's challenge, used by the Philistines in mutual encouragement (1 Sam. 4⁹). This summons to a strong-handed régime is followed by the harsh injunctions of vv. 5^{ff.}. **4.** *YHWH's word which he spoke concerning me* : resuming 2 Sam. 7^{12ff.}. **5. 6.** Joab's treacherous assassination of Abner (2 Sam. 3^{27ff.}) and of Amasa (20^{8ff.}) was to be avenged, not on the modern ground of vindication of the law, but for protection against the fate that haunted the dynasty, if it did not remove the blood-guilt, according to the ancient principle of 'life for life' (Ex. 21²⁴), a principle that David had followed in visiting upon Saul's grandchildren his murder of the Gibeonites (2 Sam. 21). For the subject at large see Pedersen, *Israel*, I-II, 411 ff., 'Sin and Curse.' The reason given is rendered colourless in the text of \mathfrak{H} , which has it that Joab stained his own girdle and sandal with innocent blood, when war was not on; but David's point is that the guilt fell upon himself and his family as the responsible authority. Following change of the suffixed pronouns as in the Lucianic Greek and Old Latin we obtain the original: *He imposed [\mathfrak{H} set, EVV shed] the blood of war on (the state of) peace, and he put the blood of war on my [\mathfrak{H} his] girdle, that is on my [\mathfrak{H} his] loins, and on my [\mathfrak{H} his] sandal, that is on my [\mathfrak{H} his] foot.* The first sentence is a crux, and an interpretation given by the old VSS named above has been accepted by many scholars (see Note); but it is legalistic, exactly paralleled by a law in Dt. 22⁸: "When thou buildest a new house, thou shalt make a battlement for thy roof, that thou impose [EVV bring] not blood upon thy house, if any man fall from thence." There the blood-guilt stains the house and makes the owner liable; in our passage it is a blood-mark against the authority even in time of peace. The horror of blood-guilt is illustrated by a story that Herodotus tells (i, 91), how Cræsus, according to the Delphic oracle paid the penalty for "the sin of his ancestor in the fifth degree, who had slain his master." *Do according to thy wisdom: cf. v. 9.* Wisdom in the old Hebrew is always practical intelligence; it is wisdom of this kind, political, legal, that the oracle in ch. 3 promises to Solomon. As Skinner remarks, the prince is bidden to 'find some specious pretext.' **7.** Barzillai's hospitality to David in his flight is recounted in 2 Sam. 17^{27ff.},

19^{32ff.}. The phrase, 'to eat at the king's table,' meant 'to be pensioned'; cf. 2 Sam. 9⁷, 19²⁹, below 18¹⁹ (of the prophets at Jezebel's table), Neh. 5¹⁷. Rawlinson cites Greek sources for continuance of the term in Persian times, e.g., Herodotus, iii, 132. Cf. the corresponding Aramaic phrase, 'to eat the salt of the king' (Ezr. 4¹⁴), of Babylonian origin. The same pensioning system existed in Egypt, e.g., at the end of the Sinuhe Story: "Meals were brought me from the palace, three and four times a day" (Erman, *Lit. of the Anc. Egyptians*, 28). So they came to (*drew nigh unto*) me: so EVV; but the verb means 'to be neighbourly.' 8. For Shimei's curse and its condonation by David see 2 Sam. 16^{5ff.}, 19^{16ff.}. *Grievous curse*: better, *baleful curse*; see Note. Despite David's whilom mercy the uttered curse was still potent; for its concreteness cf. Zech. 5^{1ff.}. It might ultimately be warded off by killing the invoker; see extracts from magical texts in Jastrow, *Rel. Bab. u. Ass.*, 2, 303 ff.; Meissner, *Bab. u. Ass.*, 2, 303 ff. The curse against 'a prince' was high crime; cf. 21^{9ff.}, Ex. 22²⁷. A 'superstitious foreboding' must have led to 'this utterly dishonourable action' (Skinner).

VV.^{10, 11}. Editorial note on the death of David and the chronology of his reign. 10. The 'sleeping with the fathers' is euphemism. The burial, as usual for people with landed estates (cf. 2³⁴, 1 Sam. 25¹, 2 Ch. 33²⁰), was on royal domain, *in David's City*; for this new name for the old Jerusalem on the Ophel hill see 2 Sam. 5⁹. This royal tomb was known for a thousand years or more, cf. Acts 2²⁹; it was rifled by John Hyrcanus for its treasures, and a similar attempt was made by Herod (Jos., *Ant.*, vii, 15, 3; xvi, 7, 1). For the modern remains of this sepulchral grotto on the Ophel see R. Weill, *La Cité de David*, and for the excavations on the Ophel in general, R. A. S. Macalister and J. G. Duncan, *Annual IV* of PEF (1926); J. W. Crowfoot and J. G. Duncan, *Annual V* (1926); also the excellent summary accounts in C. Watzinger, *DP* 1, 86 ff., 104 ff. For burial rites in Palestine see Benzinger, *HA* §§25, 43. 11. The data of the v. are repeated from 2 Sam. 5^{4f.}, where the figure for the reign is given more exactly as 40½ years. For this round figure—a generation, so common in the Bible, cf. the '40 years' in which Omri occupied Moab according to the Mesha inscription, and for its reliability here

see Int., §16a. There is an interesting Greek insertion after v.^{12a} giving Solomon's age at accession as his 12th year. This datum, accepted by Olmstead (*HPS* 338) is surely legendary; it can be traced back as far as the Jewish historian Eupolemos, ca. 150 B.C., and the same computation was adopted by the Rabbis. The calculation doubtless started from Solomon's description of himself as 'a little child' (3⁷), 12 years being also the age of religious manhood (cf. Luke 2¹²). Similarly the other hero of the temple, king Josiah, is gratuitously given by the Chronicler the age of 8 years when he began his religious devotion (2 Ch. 34³—see Comm., II. 22¹). Josephus makes Solomon 14 years old at accession (*Ant.*, viii, 7, 8). According to the dating of his son Rehoboam (14²¹) the latter must have been born by the time of his father's accession. See more at length and for the literature Kittel, Stade, Rahlfs (*SS* 3, 112), and in particular Nestle, 'Wie alt war Salomo als er zur Regierung kam?' *ZAW* 1932, 311 ff., offering a formula whereby the figure 12 was obtained.

VV.¹²⁻²⁵. The romance and fate of Adonijah. 12. The v. is generally taken by trr. and comm. as sequel of vv.^{10f}. (and so the paragraphing of **¶11**); cf. the usual complement, "and his son X reigned in his stead" (e.g., 11⁴³). But the phrase 'to sit upon the throne' is identical with the language in 1¹³, 2¹⁶, while the Heb. syntax makes of the v. a dependent nominal sentence circumstantial to the following narrative (cf. 1³). Accordingly translate: *And Solomon having taken his seat upon his father David's throne, and his rule being well established, (13) then came Adonijah*, etc. We have then to suppose that the original narrative had a brief reference to David's death, which was replaced by the editorial formula in vv.^{10f}. This paragraphing, as proposed, was recognized by the Lucianic revision, which prefixes to v.¹² the title '3 Kingdoms,' and here indeed is the proper place for distinction between Samuel and Kings; see Int., §1. The settlement of *the kingdom* (by dynastic succession, etc.) repeats literally the terms at 1 Sam. 20³¹, 2 Sam. 7²⁶; cf. a similar phrase at Amaziah's accession after his father's murder by a court cabal (II. 14⁵).

This short story is one of the most exquisite in Hebrew letters, with its subject of a romance culminating in a tragedy,

and for its brilliant delineation of the scene and the characters. If the story were motivated by court propaganda, it still remains a literary gem. There is the manly figure of Adonijah, with his frank assertion of prior right to the throne, while he loyally accepts the turn of fate (v.¹⁵, *the kingdom is turned about*—see Note); Bathsheba's womanly interest in his love-affair, to which she finds no objection; the scene of royal courtesy to *the Queen-Mother* (v.¹⁹), and the third *persona dramatis*, the king, who is ready to grant her any boon, but who on hearing her request in a burst of rude temper denies it to her, as though she were a fellow-conspirator against the throne, and condemns the upstart to death—a sentence immediately carried out (vv.^{21ff.}). With most commentators, there is no reason to doubt the essential credibility of the story, although Olmstead (*HPS* 335 f.) and Robinson (*HI* 1, 245 f.) regard it, the one as 'partisan history,' the other as 'almost inconceivable.' Arguments for its authenticity are well presented by Benzinger, Kittel, Skinner. As observed above, the references to Abishag (I^{1ff.} 15) have their dramatic place in leading up to the present scene; she was not David's wife, as is expressly stated there, and this was known to Bathsheba. Whether Adonijah's request followed a real passion, or whether he had a crafty design on the succession (so Benzinger), may remain a matter of dispute. On the other hand Solomon had legal right to interpret the request as involving claim upon the throne (*cf.* Absalom's public maltreatment of his father's harem, 2 Sam. 16^{20ff.}, and for the Semitic notion in general see W. R. Smith, *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia*² [1895], 104 ff.), while the popular mind might have so construed Adonijah's success; at least it was a legal pretext that the king easily seized. In v.²⁴ the statement, *who has made me a house, i.e., 'established my dynasty,'* cites the identical promise to David (2 Sam. 7¹¹). The one textual change of importance is at end of v.²², where, in place of *It*, *even for him and for Abiathar the priest and for Joab ben Seruiah* is to be read, with the VSS, *and he has (i.e., on his side) A. the priest and Joab b. S.* At v.¹⁹ for, *he made obeisance to her*, the Grr. have the variant, *he kissed her*; see Note. For the 'oath by YHWH,' v.²⁴, *cf.* J. Pedersen, *Der Eid bei den Semiten* (1914).

V.²⁶⁻²⁷. The deposition and banishment of Abiathar. The king acts upon his real or assumed suspicions concerning Adonijah's party. **26.** The priest Abiathar is ordered to go to Anathoth, *to thy estate*—*cf.* the similar sentence upon Shimei, v.³⁶—for he is already potentially *a dead man*. His life is spared because of his long and faithful service to David, being the survivor of Eli's family, whom Saul exterminated (1 Sam. 22, 23^{6ff.}). For the continuation of this priestly line at Anathoth see Jer. 1¹, according to which Jeremiah was 'one of the priests at Anathoth'; for the bearing of this family tradition upon his spirit as prophet see the commentaries and the studies of his person. *Because thou didst bear the ark of YHWH [Y + the Lord] before my father David*: see Note for the preferable reading of *the ephod for the ark*. **27.** *And Solomon suspended him from functioning as priest*: there is no reason to doubt, as with some (*e.g.*, Stade), the originality of this sentence; Abiathar's disability did not affect his offspring. The latter part of the v. cites the secondary narratives in 1 Sam. 2^{27ff.}, 3^{1ff.}, concerning the perpetual curse that was to lie on Eli's family, these narratives being inspired by the success of the rival Sadokids. It is withal strange that Abiathar's replacement by Sadok is not recorded here; see on v.^{35b}. Comparison of 2 Sam. 8¹⁷ and 1 Ch. 24^{3ff.}, and also the direct testimony of Jos., *Ant.*, viii, 1, 3, as to Eli's descent from Ithamar, Aaron's younger son, indicate that the Elids as Ithamarids functioned as a minority clan in the priesthood of the Second Temple.

VV.²⁸⁻³⁵. Upon news of Adonijah's death Joab flees to sanctuary; he is executed there by Benaiah, after the king overrules the right of sanctuary; Benaiah is appointed in his place. Joab's fear is abruptly introduced, but it was reasonable. He took sanctuary at the Tent as his leader had done, supposing himself to be secure after that precedent (1^{49ff.}). The right of sanctuary was an early taboo; but Hebrew law began early to regulate it, as we learn from the Code of the Covenant (Ex. 21^{13f.}), while a much more elaborate regulation was laid down in the Priest Code (Num. 35^{9ff.}); see Driver and Gray respectively *ad locos*, and at large N. M. Nicolsky, 'Das Asylrecht in Israel,' *ZAW* 1930, 146 ff.; M. Löhr, *Das Asylwesen im A.T.*, Königsberg Academy, Geisteswiss.

Klasse, vii, 3 (1930). The more civilized Hebrew law regarded the right as temporary to save the manslayer from the hasty application of the principle of blood-guilt. The new development gave time for adequate trial, and then, if found guilty, the criminal was surrendered to 'the blood-avenger'; the later Priest Code kept even the involuntary slayer in sanctuary until the death of the high priest. In the present case, the first on record in legal history, we see presented to the organized state in the person of its monarch the problem how to deal with that archaic relic of primitive law; royalty here assumes a superior right. Nicolsky sketches the history of the right of sanctuary in Mediæval Europe, where it had a devious course, due to various interests of society. The ethics of Solomon's motive is another matter. Respect to the proprieties is shown in the summons to Joab to abandon sanctuary; upon his refusal Benaiah must get further instructions from the king. A parallel appears in the case of Athaliah, who was forcibly removed from the temple by the priest's orders in advance of execution (II. 11^{13ff.}).

28. The parenthesis, *for Joab was an adherent of Adonijah, and he had not been an adherent of Absalom*, appears superfluous in the story; the first sentence repeats what is immediately known to the reader, while the second introduces an apparently gratuitous reference to Joab's antagonism to the other pretender Absalom; but it is an attempt at part-exculpation of the one-time hero of Israel. The Gr. texts, with few exceptions, supported by Josephus (*Ant.*, viii, 1, 4), and all other VSS exc. \mathcal{T} (see Note) read 'Solomon' for 'Absalom,' a rdg. accepted, e.g., by Thenius, Stade, Šanda; but Keil well remarks that the rebellious 'siding with' could hardly have been used of the heir-apparent's party; the statement also would be mere repetition of the preceding one. The altar was in the tent of YHWH, a specification more exact than at 1⁵⁰.

29. After *by the altar* the Gr. have a long addition: *And Solomon sent a message to Joab: What is the matter with thee that thou hast fled to the altar? And Joab said: Because I was afraid of thee, and I fled to the Lord.* Critics differ as to the originality of this intrusion, which can be easily turned back into good Hebrew, while the passage may well have dropped out by haplog. between the two occurrences of 'he

sent.' Thenius, Kittel (not so definitely in *BH*), Burney, Eissfeldt allow or favour it; Benzinger, Stade, Šanda, Skinner disallow it. While not necessary (*cf.* the parenthesis in v.²⁸), it gives a plausible motive to the king's action; Joab confesses a guilty conscience towards the king. **31.** Joab is to be given honourable burial, as was done for Saul and his family (1 Sam. 31^{11f.}, 2 Sam. 21^{12ff.}). **32.** The v. repeats the substance of v.⁵, and Klostermann, Benzinger, Stade object to the repetition, but hardly with reason in this kind of narrative. *And YHWH will turn back upon his head the blood that he shed (H his bloodshed): n.b.* the variation of phrase in v.³³, and *cf.* the similar phrases, Jud. 9⁵⁷, 1 Sam. 25³⁹. The head as the most eminent part of the body became a legal term expressive of the person in its civic dignity and responsibility; it can mean 'the person,' as at 1 Sam. 28² ('keeper of my head'—*cf.* Eze. 9¹⁰, etc.), even as the same vocable is so used in Ethiopic. Abner is entitled *captain of the army of Israel*, for which *cf.* 2 Sam. 2^{8f.}, and Amasa *captain of the army of Judah*, *cf. ib.* 17²⁵, 20^{4f.}; these *reff.* contradict Benzinger, who holds that the language is subsequent to the division of the kingdom. **34.** *And went up Benaiah:* *cf.* Adonijah's 'coming down' from the altar (1⁵³), and so in all ecclesiastical language, the altar being always relatively elevated. G (present in S^m ⋆) om. the sentence, and Stade unreasonably follows suit on the ground that the road from the palace to the tent 'did not ascend.' *He was buried in his house in the Steppe:* G^L, modernizing, corrects 'house' to 'tomb'; but *cf.* the burial of Samuel and Manasseh each 'in his house' (1 Sam. 25¹, 2 Ch. 33²⁰), while this custom of burial in the soil under the house is vouched for by the burial remains in Palestine (see Watzinger, *DP* 1, 72; Thomsen, *Palästina u. seine Kultur*, 54 ff.), as also for the Euphrates valley (Meissner, *Bab. u. Ass.*, 2, 496 f.). However 'house' may mean not only the structure but also the house plot as well. The word *Steppe* translates Heb. *midbār* (EVV by unfortunate translation, 'wilderness' after the Greek and Latin); it means a grazing-steppe (sheep-run), for which term see the writer's *Arabia and the Bible*, 79 f. The reference here is geographical, the word being used of the eastern portion of Judah (see Smith, *HG* 263 ff.), and it is so used absolutely otherwise

(e.g., Josh. 15⁶¹, 1 Sam. 23¹⁴), with the fuller phrase 'Steppe of Judah' found only in the late title of Ps. 63 (cf. Mt. 3¹) and Jud. 1¹⁶, where 'Judah' should probably be deleted. Joab's family belonged to Bethlehem; see 2 Sam. 2³². 35a. For Benaiah's title as *Over-the-Army* see Comm. 4^{1ff.} 35b. The statement of Sadok's appointment to succeed the deposed Abiathar is out of place here; it were desiderated after v.27. The writer has argued for excision of the half-verse as unoriginal in his article on 'The Year-Eponymate'; cf. his 'Supplement at End of 3 Kingdoms 2.' At 4² (see further Comm., *ad loc.*) the primary text represented by Ⓔ has simply 'Azariah ben Sadok,' vs. Ⓓ, the priest 'Azariah ben Sadok.' 'The priest Sadok' has appeared in the story above; in Sam. he is named as a priest along with Ahimelek (II. 8¹⁷—but the text is to be corrected to 'Abiathar b. Ahimelek'), otherwise along with Abiathar (15^{24ff.}, 20²⁵). There is no further reference to him until Eze. (40¹⁶, etc.), Ch. (1, 6³⁸, etc.), presenting the high-priestly line as descended from him.

VV.^{36-46a}. Shimei is given amnesty, but under sworn restriction to reside in Jerusalem. His breach of the condition by an excursion into foreign territory in search of run-away slaves entailed his death. Solomon followed out his father's injunction; he proved himself 'a clever man' (v.9), and found an opportunity to get rid of Shimei on a legally faultless ground, for perjury to his God and king. Shimei, a member of the Saulid family (2 Sam. 16^{5ff.}), must have been a landed proprietor of wealth, and there may have been policy in David's leniency towards him. He was ordered *not to cross* (even) *the Kidron wady, i.e.*, on the road to his estate at Bahurim to the east of Jerusalem (see Abel, *GP* 2, 260), and the restraint must have been irksome enough within the walls of a small acropolis city, whose circumference has been estimated at some 4500 feet (Smith, *Jer.*, 1, 142 f.). His breaking of bounds was careless indeed, if not presumptuous. Gath, whither his slaves had fled, one of the cities of the old Philistine pentarchy (for its location and notes on its later history see Comm. at II. 12¹⁸) had doubtless been involved in the punishment inflicted by David upon the Philistines (2 Sam. 8¹), and so remained under strict legal obligations, as for instance the return of fugitives from justice. The report of the escape

of the slaves reads like private Akkadian documents bearing on the same subject. Their housing in foreign territory required personal negotiation with the local king. The Code Hammurabi contains ordinances regarding slaves of extra-territorial origin (§§280, 281), and in the present case the slaves were formally extradited. There is extensive illustration of the extradition of fugitives in the second millennium. We have the treaty of Ramses and the Hittite king Hattushil, providing for the return of fugitives, gentlemen and men 'of no name' (see Breasted, *ARE* 3, §§382-90, cf. his *HE* 438 f.); there is in addition a long list of such diplomatic documents of Hittite kings in treaty with vassal states, according to which men of lower class, peasants and hand-workers, not noblemen, should be extradited without question (see Löhr, *Das Asylwesen im A.T.*, 3 ff., with the texts in question cited from *MVG* 1923, 23; 1926, 21, 59, 139; 1930, 75). A king of Gath, Achish ben Ma'ok, appears in the early history of David as his friend (1 Sam. 21^{11ff.}, 27^{2ff.}); the present Achish b. Ma'kah is doubtless the same prince, in that case a long-lived monarch. 42. The expression, *I have heard*, means *I am witness*, and so the South Arabic use of the root. 44. There is evident duplication in the v. : *Thou knowest all the wickedness, what thy heart knows, what thou didst*, etc. Stade suggests omitting the first words, and so reads : *Thy heart knows*, etc., which is preferable to omitting the second duplicate (so *BH* suggests), as the former improvement gives a more unique phrase. One may speculate whether in such cases we possess errors of the original written text, the author having reversed language or construction, and failed to delete the first form, for it was not ancient practice to score out mistakes in a manuscript. However, despite the present 'monstrosity' (Stade), translators and commentators have found sense, at least with slight correction, and so even the critical Thenius, while Burney ignores the difficulty.

1. וָיָא : the verb used of testamentary disposition, and so at II. 20¹, Gen. 49²⁹; the same use of the root in Arab. (Wellh., *Reste arab. Heidentums*, 19); in later Jewish language וָיָא is used of similar testaments. Ⓞ (B A, also Ⓞ^H), ἀπεκρίματο=וָיָא; Ⓞ^L, Ⓞ^H (M N *al.*) ἐνετείλατο. Ⓞ^L has a considerable plus at beginning of the v. : "and it came to pass after these things, and David died, and he was buried with his fathers," followed by the substance

of \mathfrak{H} ; on this addition see St. and Rahlfs (SS 3, 285); as has not been remarked, this plus is a duplicate of v.¹⁰, and points to a text-form in which David's testament was omitted, even as in the primitive Gr. the proscription of Shimei was left out (see at end of Notes).—2. אָנִי: \mathfrak{G} *εγω εμι*: this pedagogical peculiarity is generally regarded as Aquilanic, so by Reider, *Prolegomena* . . . to *Aquila*, 24; but Thackeray (*JTS* 8, 272 f.) notes it as typical of one of the several early trr. of Ki.; cf. Rahlfs, SS 3, 259.—וַיִּהְיֶה לָאִישׁ: the same phrase, and after הוֹק, put in the mouth of the Philistines, 1 Sam. 4⁹; for the strong use of וַיִּהְיֶה cf. *ib.* 26¹⁵; the phrase = Hellenistic ἀνδρίζεσθαι, BSir. 34²⁵ (31³⁰), 1 Mac. 2⁶⁴, 1 Cor. 16¹³. \mathfrak{G} (B A *al.*) literally, *εση εις ανδρα*; \mathfrak{G}^L exegetically plus *δυναμεις*, and so M N *al.* plus *τελειον*.—3. For a list of the Deuteronomic phrases in Ki., beginning in these vv., see Dr., *Int.*, 200 ff.—וַיִּשְׂרַח: \mathfrak{G}^L , with theologizing improvement, τ. θεου Ισραηλ.—וַיִּשְׂרַח: *text. rec.* is correct, not וַיִּשְׂרַח, with MSS, some Grr.—וַיִּתְחַוֶּה: an addition to the primary text, absent in \mathfrak{G} (B; \mathfrak{S}^H as from Sym., Theod.).—וַיִּשְׂרַח: 'know how to do,' also used transitively, e.g., Dt. 29⁸; with the following שֶׁ אֵשׁ הַתְּנֶה שֶׁ="and whithersoever thou turnest," there is 'a slight zeugma' (Burn.); 1 MS has אֵל for אֵשׁ, obtaining identity with the phrase at Pr. 17⁸. Note the primary sense of אֵשׁ as 'place.' \mathfrak{G}^L alone of the Grr. understood the Heb., πανταχη ου εαν επιβλεψης εκει. \mathfrak{G} paraphrased.—4. גִּלִּי: B \mathfrak{C} om.—לֹא־רָאָה: original by testimony of \mathfrak{G} ; critics since Then. generally delete, following \mathfrak{G}^L N *al.*; but cf. repetition of וַיִּשְׂרַח, vv.¹³¹, of וַיִּשְׂרַח, 3²⁶; Burn. cites numerous cases of similar repetitions, e.g., 1³⁰, 8³⁰, 41-42, 13¹¹; and the corresponding Akk. *umma* is similarly used in long *oratio directa* (see Delitzsch, *Ass. Hwb.*, 86). Here the repetition emphasizes the positive oracle.—5. אֵשׁ עֵשָׂה: staccato resumption of 1⁰; improvement attempted by 12 MSS Ken., deR., with וַיִּשְׂרַח= \mathfrak{G}^L \mathfrak{S}^H \mathfrak{S}^A ; St. regards the clause as a doublet.—אָבִיר: once אָבִיר, 1 Sam. 14⁵⁰; the constant Gr. Αβεννηρ, as here, exhibits the late survival of the old \mathfrak{K} r.; and so Αβεσσαλωμ, v.⁷; see Noth, *IP* 34.—יָהֳרָא: יָהֳרָא, 2 Sam. 17²⁵; other forms יָהֳרָן, יָהֳרָן; the name is Arabian (S. Arab. 'Watar' Old Bab. 'Yatar'), and Jether was an Ishmaelite acc. to 1 Ch. 2¹⁷ and the correct Gr. at 2 Sam. 17²⁵, vs. \mathfrak{H} ; the later Ituræans bore a name of the same stock. For hypocoristic form in א- (so also עֵשָׂה, *sup.*, and נִיא, *inf.*, v.⁸) see Noth, p. 40.—וַיִּהְיֶה: epexegetical, cf. 18¹³; see Burn., and Dr., *Tenses*, 82.—וַיִּשְׂרַח: by ancient haplog. MSS 60 80 109 125 174, and \mathfrak{G} (B M *al.*) om. כְּלָחַם . . . בשלם. As noted in Comm., read בְּחַרְתִּי, בְּחַרְתִּי, בְּחַרְתִּי, with \mathfrak{G}^L \mathfrak{I} . The same VSS render וַיִּשְׂרַח as though וַיִּקָּם, 'and he avenged,' and רַבִּי כְּלָחַם as though רַבִּי הָיָה or דָּם נָקִי, 'innocent blood.' These corrections have been largely accepted, e.g., by Kit., Burn., St. (at length), Eissf., *BH*, in part by Šanda, *al.* But as for the verb the alleged corruption of intelligible וַיִּקָּם as וַיִּשְׂרַח is improbable, as also that of וַיִּקָּם as דָּם נָקִי. The interpretation of \mathfrak{H} was indeed

difficult; see Comm. **Ⓣ** has a most obscure expansion.—**6.** כהנבחר : for the noun **Ⓜ** has original *φρονησιον vs. σοφιαν* of *al.*; *n.b.* *φρονιμος*, Gr., 2³⁵⁰, and the variations in Grr., 3¹².—**7.** לא: B a₂ *su*, early error for *su=C* **Ⓜ**.—[שנתן]: B a₂ *πολων*, error for *πολιαν*.—**7.** בדולי: Noth interprets (p. 225) as of personal quality, 'Iron-Man.'—נאבלי: for נב='in class of,' *cf.* בנקרים, Am. 1¹.—קרבו: the verb as generally translated is not clear, and Klost. attempts emendation; but *cf.* קרוב, 'neighbour' (|| to רעה, Ps. 15³).—**8.** נמריצה: the same ppl. at Mic. 2¹⁰, הבל נכרץ, Job 6²⁵, is generally emended; *cf.* Akk. *namrāṣu*, 'sickness,' Arab. *marīd*.—**9.** ענה: corroborated by **Ⓜ** at 2³⁵⁰, hence an early rdg.; but the emphatic pron. אנה is demanded, and so **Ⓜ** read; its absence in B *al.*, **Ⓜ** is due to haplog. with foll. *su*.—**8. 9.** Additional Note. **Ⓜ** and **Ⓜ** contain a parallel text to these vv. in Gr. 2³⁵¹⁻⁰; the latter is the earlier translation, belonging to the appendix of materials which had been omitted in the first form of Kgdms; see the writer's article, 'The Supplement at end of 3 Kingdoms 2,' and *cf.* Note after v. 46a below. The restoration here of the onetime omitted passage is practically the text of **Ⓜ**, and may be regarded as insertion from that source. In this Supplement B A M N *al.* (not **Ⓜ**) have a doublet for בן נרא, *uios Γηρα, uios (του) σπερματος, i.e.*, as though בן יוע; the correct *n. pr.* is later insertion. For כהרים B has *χεβρω*, one of many similar corruptions in that text. **Ⓜ** Γαβαθα as=נבעתה (?) cannot (as Rahlfs remarks) be explained from any inner-Greek variation. Priority of the Supplement further appears in the rendering of הכב with *φρονιμός, vs. σοφός*.—**12.** **Ⓜ** MSS prefix *βασιλειων γ'* or *β. τριτη*; see Int., §1, n. 2.—אביו: A x + *ετων δωδεκα*; M N *al.* + *uios ετων ιβ'*=**Ⓜ** obel.; see Comm., and for the history of the phrase, Rahlfs, SS 3, §23.—כלותה: this form in early historical bks. only here and 1 Sam. 20²¹, otherwise כלובה, *e.g.*, 1⁴⁶, 1 Sam. 10¹⁶; the present form is Aramaizing.—**13.** בן הנית: B a₂ **Ⓜ** om.—שילכה: Grr. + *κ. προσεκυνησεν αυτη*.—ותאמר: 1 MS + לו=Grr.; similar variations in Grr., v. 17.—**14.** ויאמר: **Ⓜ** om.; see Note on לאמר, v. 4.—**15.** ותשב: for the notion of 'the turn of fate' see Comm. on היתה סבה, 12¹⁵.—**16.** שאלה אהת: 3 MSS + קטנה=**Ⓜ** *μικραν*, from v. 20.—פני: correct, *cf.* vv. 17, 20, *vs.* OGrr., as though פניך; the same change in **Ⓜ** v. 17.—**17.** שלמה סבלך: the name given before the title by an intimate.—**19.** וישחתו לה: Grr., *και (κατ)εφίλησεν αυτην*=**Ⓜ**; Jos., 'embracing her': the extreme Oriental etiquette towards the royal mother was not understood by the freer-minded Greeks.—וישב: impersonal, as EVV recognize; see GK §144, 3; *ετεθη* of Grr. and the pl. verb of **Ⓜ** are equally correct translations, but no warrant for emendation, *vs.* St., and BH 'probabiliter'.—**21.** ימן את אבישנ: for the gender syntax see GK §121, 1.—**22.** וילאביתר הב' וליואב: read the nouns as subjects with all the VSS, including **Ⓜ**, ויואב, אביתר הב' ויואב. **Ⓣ** paraphrased, "in counsel are they, he and A. and J.," good exegesis, but no warrant for emendations proposed by Klost. and

Benz., who would add הָקָר or הִקָּר.—At end of v. Gr. add ο ἀρχιστρατηγος εταίρος; the first word is Joab's title, the second is apparently error for the pl., expegetical to the preceding dative αὐτῶ.—**23.** Solomon is said to have sworn 'by YHWH,' but in the oath itself 'God' is used, doubtless a 'Vermilderung'; MS 23 has יהוה=Gr. 71, ㉔—by true tradition? On the oath and use of ַי see Burney's extensive note.—יעשה, ייסיף: jussive forms are expected; for other such cases see GK §75, t, and cf. §109, k. For the phrase "Y. do so to me and more also," Lexx. give Arabic parallels; it is capially illustrated by the identical curse cited by Livy, i, 24, *ad fin.*: "Tu, illo die, Iupiter, populum Romanum sic ferito, ut ego hunc porcum hic hodie feriam; tanto magis ferito quanto magis potes pollesque."—**24.** וישבני: this overvocalized Kt. of received texts, starting from וישבני, as in MS 70, is due to early scribal insertion of ַי in wrong place; other MSS vary in its insertion.—**25.** ויפגע בו: a euphemism for homicide, common in Jud., Sam., Ki., perhaps with notion of resistless fate, cf. פגע רע, 5¹⁸.—The Gr. plus at end of v., 'in that day,' is gratuitous.—**26.** על: generally taken as misspelling for אל; see Note on 1³³.—שריך: the older, radical spelling of the sing., with all VSS (not pl., as in EVV); see GK §93, ss.—ביום הוה: Gr., ㉔ transfer to previous clause, to avoid notion of the possibility of the priest's execution.—"את ארון ארני": VSS, exc. ㉔ ㉕, om. ארני, which as ㉔r. has entered the text (*n.b.* Heb. variants). For ארון many recent comm., following Then. (not Kit., Burn., Sk.), read אפיר on basis of το εφουδ of הארון, 1 Sam. 14¹⁸, in correspondence with the statement of 'the ephod' that Abiathar carried "in his hand," acc. to 23⁶⁻⁹, 30⁷. See T. C. Foote, 'The Ephod,' *JBL* 21 (1902), 1 ff. This position is stoutly disputed by W. R. Arnold in *Ephod and Ark* (*Harvard Theol. Studies*, 1917), rejecting the Gr. correction in text cited above. However the ark, known to have been located at a provincial point (2 Sam. 6¹¹), could hardly have followed David on his marches. It is preferable to accept the change on the ground that the ark, with its later importance, was substituted for the primitive instrument of divination, the ephod.—**27.** על: cf. יהועל, *n. pr. f.* in Eleph. papp.; Šanda suggests identification with well-known Arab. 'Alī, with colouring of the first vowel; Noth (*IP* 146) connects it with 'elyōn.—**28.** הישבעה באה: the phrase at 2 Sam. 13³⁰.—אבשלום: see Comm.; ㉔ is supported among the ancient authorities only by Gr. B A x a₂, ㉔. See deR. for Jewish discussion with recognition of a possible *hallūf*, or 'variant.'—**29.** הנה: Burn. remarks, "without specific suffix or pronoun following, the reference being unmistakable"; but the word= primarily *hinnēhū*, and in such a phrase the suffix was pronounced, or possibly as *hinneh* (cf. Aram.).—אצל המזבה: Gr., κατεχει τ. κερατων τ. θυσιαστηριου=㉔¹¹ ㉔; an addition from v. 28, *vs.* Then., Šanda; Burn. notes it as another case of the Gr. desire for uniformity. As Lev. 1¹⁶, 6³ show, 'beside-the-altar' was holy ground.

—At end of v. Grr. + “and bury him,” another case of uniformity; *cf.* v.³¹.—**30.** לֹא בִי: see BDB 474a, GB 341, Nestle, *ZAW* 25, 163; the K_r. variously accentuates the phrase; *e.g.*, here and at 11²² as ‘no, for,’ but at 3²² as ‘not so’; the latter retains the old absolute use of בִּי.—**35.** אַחַד צִדְקָתְךָ הִבְהִיחַ נֶתַח הַמֶּלֶךְ: Grr. + *εἰς ἕρπεια πρῶτον*, a good example of later ecclesiastical expansion.—**36.** אָנָה וְאָנָה: the phrase at II. 5²⁵.—**37.** At end of v. ִטְּ + “and the king swore him on that day,” anticipating v.⁴²; accepted by Then., Klost., but see Burn.’s counter-argument.—**38.** יָמִים רִבּוּם: Grr., harmonizing with v.³⁹, ‘three years.’—**39.** אַרְבָּעָה: ִטְּ^H; ִטְּ *Ἀρχαῖος*, ִטְּ^L *Ἀρχαῖος*; *cf.* the name of the king of Ekron in Ashurbanipal’s cylinder C, ‘Ikauso’ (*KB* 2, 149; *ARA* 2, §876), which apparently corroborates the vocalization of OGrr.—**42.** וְאָנָה: for preservation of *i* in this position see BL §56, n.—וְאָנָה . . . בָּיָמָי: Grr. render with plus from v.³⁶.—שְׁמֵעִתִּי . . . וְאָנָה: ִטְּ ִטְּ^L om., ִטְּ^H ✕, and so Benz., St., Eissf., but without sufficient reason.—**44.** אֲשֶׁר . . . אָהָה: supported by the Grr.; Klost. attempts rewriting; see Comm.—וְהִשִּׁיב: VSS, exc. ִטְּ, as thought וְהִשִּׁיב; but *cf.* v.³².—**46a.** וְיָמָה: B a₂ ִטְּ om.

The Gr. Supplement after v.³⁶. See analysis by the writer in *ZAW* 1932, 124 ff. The collection of odd materials at this point is due to the fact that at one stage of translation the bk. of Kg_{dms} was halted here, and the translator, or a successor, collected in postscript material omitted above along with data of interest from the subsequent history of Solomon’s reign. The parallelisms are here presented with some brief comments; and see Notes *ad locos*. *Cf.* also Šanda’s display, I, 330 f.

ִטְּ v. 35^a. ^b=^ח 5⁹. ¹⁰.—v.^c=3¹.—v.^d=5²⁹.—v.^e, first part items from ch. 7, second part=11^{27b}.—vv.^f. ^g=9²⁴. ²⁵.—v.^h=9²³.—v.¹=9¹⁵⁻¹⁸.—v.^k, *cf.* 3¹.—vv.¹⁻⁰=2⁸. ⁹. ³⁶⁻⁴⁶; both parts of the Shimei story had been omitted in the primary version; see Comm. *ad loc.*—v.^{46a}, *cf.* v.^{36a}.—v.^b=5¹.—vv. ^c. ^d in part=9¹⁹, in part with an original datum; see Comm.—v.^e=5². ³.—vv.^f. ^g=5⁴. ⁵.—v.^h=4¹⁻⁵; see Comm.—v.¹=5⁶.—v.^k=5¹.—v.¹, *cf.* 4¹.

Ch. 2^{46b}-3¹. The settlement of Solomon’s kingdom, and his marriage with a Pharaoh’s daughter.¹ *And the royal power being established in Solomon’s hand* (Solomon married, etc.). The phrase resumes the almost identical statement as 2^{12b},

¹ This paragraphing disagrees with that of modern versions (following the printed Vulgate), except JV. The Hebrew syntax requires the division here accepted (*cf.* similar cases in 1⁴⁻⁵), and follows Bär’s edition and *BH*, although Ginsburg makes no division until after v.². Also Josephus starts afresh here with ch. 2 of *Ant.*, iv. The OGrr. had included this material in their addenda above (see Notes at end of the last ch.), and then invented a fresh caption for the new book with “Solomon son of David reigned over Israel and Judah in Jerusalem.”

with a different word, but of the same root, for *kingdom*. The confirmation of his power is illustrated by his proud marriage. Ch. 3. 1. The royal marriage is given first in the editor's scheme, as is the case with David's wives (2 Sam. 3^{2ff.}, 5^{13ff.}), and so below the queen-mother's name is stately given with each accession to the throne. *Solomon became son-in-law of Pharaoh king of Egypt; and he took (in marriage) Pharaoh's daughter; and he brought her into David's City, until he had finished building his house and the house of YHWH and the wall of Jerusalem round about.* This is the only direct reference to the marriage. Cf. 9²⁴: "Then [so correct **H**] Pharaoh's daughter came up out of David's City to her house which he built for her. Then he built the Millo." Of these two archival items, the first is the basis of the latter part of our verse. Below, 9¹⁶ records the Pharaoh's capture of Gezer and his presentation of it as dower for his daughter. OGrr. omit our v.¹ and 9¹⁶ in place, and present them together after 5¹⁴ (Gr. 4^{31. 32}). It is a question where the historic item of the marriage originally stood. Some scholars, e.g., Benzinger, Kittel (cf. *BH*), Burney, Šanda, Skinner, would connect the item of the marriage with 9¹⁶, and place the material where OGrr. put it, after 5¹⁴. However no authority is to be assigned to the placing of the additions in **G**; the passage in question is a convenient summary of the references to the queen. The introductory statement, *he became son-in-law of Ph.*, is duplicative, but in good Semitic style, and appears to have original value, vs. Stade, who following **G**, regards it as secondary. For the building of the queen's palace there is the archival item at 7^{8b}. In our passage we find for the first time the distinction between David's City and Jerusalem (see Smith, *Jerusalem*, I, 153). All the references to this queen have been cited except the parenthetic allusion at 11¹, and the perversion of history in 2 Ch. 8¹¹. The princess' origin is still debated. Alt (in his *Israel u. Aegypten*, 11-41—the fullest discussion of these international relations), Breasted (*HE* 529), Olmstead (*HPS* 340) find in her a daughter of Sheshonk I, founder of the 22nd or Libyan Dynasty, the Shishak of 14²⁵; Meyer thinks of Psusennis the last of the 21st, Tanite Dynasty (*GA* 2, 2, 263); Šanda and Kittel prefer one of the earlier kings of this dynasty. Sheshonk's accepted succession as of date 945 B.C.

would make him a very late contemporary of Solomon, whose accession is generally dated some 25 years earlier. Meyer remarks that this distinguished marriage may have given Solomon the impulse to his palace constructions. Winckler's scoffing at the story of this marriage (*GI* 2, 63; *KAT* 236) on the basis of the Pharaonic declaration in Tell el-Amarna tablet no. 3 that "daughters of the king of Egypt are never given to others" is not pertinent for these late and degenerate dynasties. There is indeed the parallel and authentic story of an Edomite prince's marriage with a Pharaoh's sister-in-law and their child's adoption in the royal palace (11^{14ff.}). Gunkel, in his *Einl. in die Psalmen*, 151 ff., gives a long list of such ancient international marriages.

VV.^{2. 3.} An editorial moralizing introduction to the story of Solomon's dream at the high-place at Gibeon. **2.** *Only the people were sacrificing at the high-places, because there was no house built for the Name of YHWH up to those days.* The statement with its unmediated 'only' appears to be from the hand of a secondary editor, who modelled the expression after the usual exception made subsequently in the count of the virtues of good kings, e.g., Jehoshaphat, 22⁴⁴, Joash, II. 12⁴. It is then an exculpatory extension of the exception made by the first editor in v.³. For the definition of 'the house,' etc., see Comm. at 8¹⁷. **3.** *And Solomon loved YHWH, walking in the statutes of his father David; only he was sacrificing and burning incense at the high-places.* The usual interpretation of Heb. *bāmāh* with 'high-place' (so modern VSS after the Greek and Latin translators) is here kept in lieu of any English word expressive of the Biblical aversion to those heathenish shrines. The Chronicler exculpates the sainted builder of the temple: "[He] went to the high-place at Gibeon, for there was the Tent of Meeting" (2 Ch. 1³). Šanda suggests placing v.^{2b} after v.³, but the passage is too much of a mosaic to attempt restoration of an original. For the high-places see the works on O.T. archæology and religion (a recent statement by Albright is cited in the Notes), and in particular the reports of excavations, every one of which has revealed the remains of such ancient sanctuaries. *He loved YHWH*: Deuteronomic phrase (Dt. 10¹², etc.), but with a complement, *walking in the statutes, i.e., those, morals, of his father David*, as the word is also used

at II. 17^{8, 21} of evil morals. The verb generally translated here with *burnt incense* (JV *offered*) may be taken in its root mng., 'to make to smoke,' used of the sweet savour of the burning sacrifice (*cf.* Gen. 8^{20f.}), or as denominative from the noun for 'incense,' as rendered above. The earlier objection to the latter mng., namely that incense did not reach Palestine until a much later age, is now fully disposed of by the discovery of numerous and highly elaborate censers, *e.g.*, the remarkable specimen found at Taanach by Sellin (presented by Barton, *AB* fig. 210), while they appear to have been of common domestic use, going back well into the second millennium; indeed we know from Egypt that the Arabian incense trade was of early origin, and we may compare the name of Abraham's concubine, Keturah, doubtless related to *ḥētōret*, 'incense.' For a study of the small censers see S. Przeworski, 'Les censoirs de la Syrie,' *Syria*, 1930, 133 ff. The two terms 'sacrificing' and 'censing' may express the round of worship; and so at 11⁸ (with Solomon's heathenish wives as subject), II. 12⁴ (with the people as subject).

4-15. Solomon at the great high-place at Gibeon has a dream, in which, upon the divine promise of any boon, he asks and receives the gift of wisdom, *to judge this thy great people* (v.⁹). There appears now the first extensive parallel of the Chronicler to Ki. (2 Ch. 1¹⁻¹³). **4.** *And the king went to Gibeon to sacrifice there, for it was the great high-place; a thousand burnt-offerings was Solomon wont to offer upon that altar.* It is not so remarkable that the king went to Gibeon to sacrifice at its high-place, as that the story has been so artlessly preserved. The secondary conclusion in v.¹⁵ makes the king return to Jerusalem to offer sacrifices there 'before the Ark'; the Chronicler assuages the difficulty by locating at Gibeon the Tent of Meeting and Bezalel's brazen altar, although the Ark 'in a tent' was in Jerusalem. Gibeon has been identified with el-Jīb, 6 mi. N.W. of Jerusalem; for the earlier tradition see Robinson (*BR* 2, 136 ff.), for recent authorities Albright (*AASOR* 4 [1924], 104), Abel (*GP* 2, 335 f.), these without question; Galling (*BR s.v.*) gives a summary account of recent various theories for the location of this and other sites to the north of Jerusalem, himself coming to no positive conclusion. Why that sanctuary was

preferred as *the great high-place* (the Heb. expresses the superlative) in Solomon's day is obscure. The Gibeonites had remained a Canaanite enclave since the conquest (Jos. 9^{3ff.}, ch. 10); their treaty rights were so respected that David delivered to them seven grandsons of Saul for death to atone for an outrage committed by that king (2 Sam. 21^{1ff.}). We may assume the Gibeonites' formal acceptance of the conquerors' deity (*n.b.* Jos. 9⁹). As extra-territorial the place may have been selected by royalty for policy's sake; *cf.* David's creation of an absolutely new sacred centre with no Israelite tradition. There are few other cases of such local Yahweh-altars—on Carmel (18³⁰), on Nebo according to the Mesha stele (line 18), and *cf.* Absalom's vow that had to be fulfilled at Hebron (2 Sam. 15^{7ff.}). For the *burnt-offering*, properly 'holocaust,' see Nowack, *Arch.*, 2, 214 ff., Benzinger, *Arch.*, 362. The *thousand* of burnt-offerings need not be taken literally. *Cf.* the artificial distinction between *μυρία* and *μύριος*. We possess in the Greek 'hekatomb' the parallel of a loosely used ritual term; this word, which means 'a hundred oxen,' is used by Homer of smaller numbers of victims, in one case of eight oxen (*Il.*, vi, 93, 115), or the sacrifice might consist of rams or sheep (xxiii, 147, 864). According to Herodotus, Cræsus and Xerxes made sacrifices by the thousands (i, 50; vii, 43). South Arabian inscriptions give extravagant figures. There is no reason with Benzinger to regard the whole v., or with Stade the second half, as redactional; why should a later age have magnified Solomon's irregular worship on a *bâmāh* at Gibeon? Indeed the somewhat conceit of the verse arouses the suspicion that the story springs from Gibeon, in opposition to Jerusalem, which should be the place where 'YHWH is to be seen' (Gen. 22¹⁴). For the king presiding as *summus sacerdos* see Comm., 8^{11ff.}.

5-14. || 2 Ch. 1^{7ff.}. Solomon's dream belongs to an extensive chapter of ancient religious psychology and praxis. The dream, or night vision, has its occasional part in earlier Biblical narratives; *e.g.*, for Isaac at Beersheba (Gen. 26²⁴), Jacob at Bethel, and with further such experiences (28¹¹, 31¹¹, 32^{22ff.}, 46²). The Philistine king Abimelek had a dream-warning (20³), the Pharaoh a symbolical dream (ch. 40), and so even a common soldier (Jud. 7¹³). The nearest approach to the present story

is that of the oracle by night in the sanctuary to the young Samuel (1 Sam. 3). The dream was early recognized as one of the normal ways of divine revelation; so 1 Sam. 28⁶: "YHWH answered Saul neither by dreams, nor by Urim, nor by prophets." But visions and dreams were inferior to the direct word-of-mouth revelations given to Moses (Num. 12^{6ff.}). The Biblical dreams located at sanctuaries, Beersheba, Bethel, Shiloh, Gibeon, doubtless had connexion in fact with the ancient practice of oneiromancy at shrines, with a ritual praxis that induced such phenomena. Petrie interpreted the rings of stones at the turquoise mines of Serābit as cubicles for such incubation on part of the seekers of the precious stones (*Researches in Sinai*, 1906, 65 ff.). The present dream story is the last recorded in the Bible until the days of Apocalyptic; the practice fell into disrepute, and Jeremiah bitterly inveighed against the prophets who dream dreams (23^{23ff.}). In the youngest book of the Old Testament we have Nebuchadnezzar's dream, while the seer had 'his dreams and visions of his head upon his bed' (Dan. cc. 2, 7—see Montgomery *ad locos*). The several royal dreams cited above introduce us to a privilege extensively claimed by the Oriental monarchs from the day of Sumerian Gudea down through the line of Ashurbanipal, Nebuchadnezzar, Nabonidus, and outside of the Semitic field, the Lydian Gyges and the Persian kings, as also in Egypt; there may be added the fable of Alexander's dream concerning the Jewish high-priest in Josephus, *Ant.*, xi, 8, 5.²

² For the series of dreams to Gudea, prescribing his building of a temple, in his Cylinder A, see Barton, *Royal Inscriptions of Sumer and Akkad*, I, 204 ff. (he had his visions by incubation, *e.g.*, §II). Ashurbanipal records a divine vision by night (*AR.A* 2, no. 835), and a dream of his army (no. 807), and also reports the dream of Lydian Gyges, which bade him seek the Assyrian alliance (no. 784). The ill-fated Nabonidus records two dreams (see Jastrow, cited below). For Egypt there are the dreams of Merenptah and Tanutamun (Breasted, *ARE* 3, no. 582; 4, no. 922). For dreams of or about Persian monarchs see Herodotus, I, 107 f., III, 30, 124; VII, 19. And there is now to be added the dream by which El revealed himself to Keret, king of the Sidonians, in an Ugaritic epic (Virolleaud, *Keret*, 60 ff.). For the subject in general see Jastrow, *Rel. Bab. u. Ass.*, 2, 954 ff., and Index, *s.v.* 'Traum'; Meissner, *Bab. u. Ass.*, 244 ff.; and for the 'dream-style' Mowinckel in the *Gunkel-Eucharisterion*, 317 ff.

Accordingly the present story is entirely in the colour of the ancient Orient, innocent of the later orthodox sentiment against dreams. It observes the Biblical characteristic of the dream for God's own people as a means of direct revelation; the dream is not symbolical, requiring therefore dream-interpreters as in the Babylonian religion, the *oneiropoloi* of Herodotus (indeed it is God's people who interpret Pagan dreams, as in the case of Joseph and Daniel), but is a direct 'word' of Deity. The charm of this story is unique. Kittel comments that "there is no reason to doubt the historical character of this narrative"; that it is in origin an early, practically contemporary story, and in so far authentic, is without doubt. It is connected with the North-Israelite, actually old-Canaanite sanctuary of Gibeon; if it is of the Elohist strain, as claimed by Hölscher, it must be North-Israelite, and in that case primitive, because of the subsequent break between North and South. Moreover the divine gift to Solomon is not a temple-plan as in Gudea's case, and *cf.* Ex. 25⁹; such an invention might well have been inserted here; *cf.* the oracle to David, when he purposed to build a temple. But the boon Solomon asks for, which is granted, is judicial wisdom to fit him to *judge this thy great people*. The story well antedates the extravagant tradition of Solomon's 'wisdom' as presented in 5^{9ff.}, *cf.* 10^{1ff.}. It reflects one aspect of his administration for which we have no record, that is, the organization of the law of his realm; *n.b.* his Hall of Justice (7⁷). His taxation system is fully reported (ch. 4); the social order of his state must have been of equal concern. We may well compare with Solomon the greater Hammurabi, who in the preface to his code says: "When Marduk sent me to rule man and to promulgate justice, I put justice and righteousness into the language of the land and promoted the welfare of the people." As Kittel remarks, Solomon may have been 'the first to systematize the law of Israel' (*GVI* 2, 150). For criticism of the narrative Burney gives an exact critical display of Deuteronomistic phrases, and it is reasonable to assign the present form to the late editors. Hölscher would find his Elohist here, but the tradition of the divine Name on which he relies is uncertain. 7. *A little child*: the phrase is that of humility, and is relative; *cf.* Jesus' saying,

Mk. 10¹⁵, and the Arabic use of 'sheikh,' properly 'old man.' Rashi and Kimchi follow ancient tradition here by making Solomon 12 years old, and so the Hexaplaric gloss at 2¹². Octavianus, when he assumed his uncle's toga, *ætat.* 18, was taunted by his opponents as 'a boy.' *To go out and come in* : with the home as implied object, *i.e.*, the round of daily public life ; *cf.* 1 Sam. 18¹⁶. **9.** EVV, *an understanding heart to judge thy people* : but literally, *a heart that listens to judge thy people*. The first verb is a legal term (*cf.* use at 2⁴²) ; a similar phrase below, v. 11, where EVV render with 'to discern justice,' but the Heb. *to hear justice* means *to give a just hearing* ; *cf.* the English judicial term, 'a hearing.' In the judicial act there are two operations, the hearing of the evidence, then the decision of the intelligence (Heb. *heart*). V. 14 is regarded by Stade as a Deuteronomistic addition ; Klostermann and Benzinger elide only the condition of the first part ; Šanda finds also vv. 12b. 13b as secondary ; they are indeed extravagant utterances. The divine word thus simplified will read : **12a.** *Lo, I have done according to thy word. Lo, I have given thee a wise and understanding heart.* **13a.** *And I have also given thee what thou didst not ask, both riches and honour.* **14b.** *And I will lengthen thy days.* AV 'honour,' *vs.* the variant translation elsewhere with 'glory,' when attribute of Deity, is the best translation of the Heb. *kābôd* ; here Luther was followed with his 'Ehre.' In the Anglican Prayer Book there occurs the constant doublet, 'the honour and glory' of Deity. **15.** The v. is variously appraised by critics. Benzinger, Kittel, Stade regard it as wholly redactional ; Skinner accepts, allowing probable additions to the text. Hölcher would excise only, *and he came to Jerusalem, and stood before the ark of the covenant of the Lord*, which is evidently an intruded passage, inserted to emphasize the primacy of Jerusalem. *Cf.* the probable excision of 'in Hebron' at end of 2 Sam. 15⁸. The initial sentences, *and he awoke, and lo, it was a dream* (=Gen. 41⁷, E), are of indifferent importance critically. That *he offered burnt-offerings and made peace-offerings, and made a feast for all his ministers* (the last statement also at Gen. 40²⁰), properly concludes the scene at Gibeon, and is original.

VV. 16-28. The Judgment of Solomon. This story of a summary judicial decision has widespread parallels. Grotius cites

a similar case given by Diodorus Siculus for a Thracian king Ariopharnes, as well as a case in Suetonius's *Life of Claudius* (ch. 15). A good parallel from the Indian *Jātaka Stories* tells how a woman left her child on a river bank, a she-demon picked it up and claimed it as hers; the two appealed to the deity, who ordered them to tear the child apart and each to take half, but the real mother refused. There is also the notable Pompeian fresco, depicting such a 'judgment.'³ If our story is borrowed, it is idle to decide from what quarter. For the immediate entrance of the two women before the king, *cf.* the story of the 'wise woman' who brought her alleged domestic trouble before king David (2 Sam. 14), and, for the 'open court' that the king should grant all his subjects, the clever politics of Absalom (2 Sam. 15^{1ff.}). The ancient Oriental king was approachable to all (*cf.* 1 Sam. 18¹⁶), and such open justice still prevails in the courts of modern Arab potentates. For the two harlots—on which subject the commentators cited by Poole have considerable and amusing discussion, while some ancient texts try to modify or ignore the ugly noun—Landersdorfer pertinently compares the women who kept the drinking-places, actually 'disorderly houses,' in Babylonia, whom the Code Hammurabi severely controlled (§§108-111); indeed the Targum uses here the word for 'inn-keeper' (fem.). The 'harlot' Rahab belonged to the same class. The story is told in an effective way, with a genuine feminine strain to it; there is a certain amount of repetitiousness, which the Grr. avoided. There is to be noted the psychological expression in v.²⁶, literally, *her bowels were fermented for her son* (*cf.* Gen. 43³⁰), and so correctly for the first noun AV, while the other EVV euphemize with 'heart'; all agree in translating the sequence with "yearned upon/after her son." The development of meaning of that noun appears in

³ For the Indian tale see E. B. Cowell and W. H. D. Rouse, *Jātaka Stories*, 6 (1912), 63 ff.; H. G. Rawlinson, *Intercourse between India and the Western World* (1926), 11; for the Pompeian fresco Springer-Michaelis, *Handbuch der Kunstgesch.*, *Das Altertum*⁶, fig. 316; and Le Blaut, *Rev. Archéologique*, ser. III, 13 (1889), p. 24 and pl. iii. Gressmann's study 'Das Salomonische Urteil' in *Deutsche Rundschau*, 130 (1907), 212 ff., cites some twenty-two such cases in folk-tale and literature. See also for more recent bibliography *ERE* 7 (1914), 467; J. G. Frazer, *Folk-Lore in the O.T.*, 2, ch. 11.

'bowels of mercy,' Lk. 1⁷⁸, Col. 3¹², and finally it came to mean 'compassion.' See I. Eitan's study of the word in *JBL* 1934, 269 ff. A nice point of language appears in the same v., when the real mother varies the usual word for 'child,' *yèled*, by using another, *yālûd*, which may be translated with the etymologically equivalent 'bairn.' 18. *The third day: i.e., 'the day after the morrow.'* 21. Stade would delete one or the other of the two cases of *in the morning*, but the language is that of feminine repetitiousness. 26. 27. Omit, with OGrr. *(the) living (baby), bis*; the addition was due to the erroneous notion that the dead baby also had been brought into court, leading to the absurd development in Josephus and Lucian that the king commanded the halving of both the living and the dead child, equal parts for each woman; this humorous expansion might be based on the law in Ex. 21³⁵. 28. The story concludes with the impression made upon the people: *All Israel heard of the verdict that the king had rendered; and they stood in awe of the king, for they saw that divine wisdom was in him for executing justice.* As observed above, it is a judicial wisdom that is ascribed to Solomon in these early stories, not the philosophy of later legend. Indeed the corresponding word for Heb. 'wisdom' here, *ḥokmāh*, in the Arabic *ḥukm* means a judicial judgment. For justice as the primary royal virtue see Ps. 72^{1ff.}, and Gunkel's Comm. This popular story is sequel to that of the dream. No critical literary judgment can be easily given as to its age and provenance. Stade regards it as comparatively late; but Kittel remarks that "in its liveliness and freshness the narrative recalls J of the Pentateuch," and with this judgment Hölscher fully agrees.

46b. הממלכה: the noun, reminiscent of 2 Sam. 7¹⁶, also *inf.*, 11¹¹, etc., is generally found in prophetic diction; but note the political term עיר המ', 1 Sam. 27⁵; in Phœn. ממלכה is used frequently of the personified royalty (Harris, *Gram.*, 118).—G om. this half-verse, at 2³⁵ has the plus, "and the kingdom was established in Jerusalem."

Ch. 3. 1. ויקח: the verb in absolute sense also at 7⁸; G 2^{36c} + 'to wife.'—ויביאה: here Lagarde (his 2³; G 4³¹) has a negative ουκ, with 2 MSS, a correction after 2 Ch. 8¹¹, but a pure sport.—"את ביתו נתת ב' י": B a₂ om. (C has), then introducing with all other Gr. texts *εἰς πρωτοῖς*; i.e., the latter distinction was arbitrarily introduced to give the building of the temple precedence, and then in the two MSS noted the building of the palace was eliminated. At 9¹⁵ the order of the items is reversed. Actually

the mention of the temple here is quite out of place in connexion with the queen's residence.—2. רק: also at v.³, and so generally throughout the bk.; but at 22⁴⁴ אַךְ העַם.—B a₂ € om.—by error or of purpose?—במה: the noun, already identified with Akk. *bāmtu*, 'back,' etc., now appears in the Ugaritic prepositional form לבמה, 'upon.' See Albr., *ARI* 105 f., and accompanying note, defining the object as "an elevated platform on which cultic objects were placed"; he accepts the derivation of Gr. *bōmos*, 'altar' (otherwise of unknown etymology) from this Sem. word, *via* the Phœnician.—3. כַּטִּיִר: Nowack, *Arch.*, 2, 246 ff., denying early use of incense in Palestine, draws distinction between the Hif., used of the smoke, savour of sacrifice, and the Piel as denominative from קטר: however, to establish this distinction, the vocalization of the verbal forms must at times be corrected, e.g., 1 Sam. 2¹⁶, קטר יקטירן, with combination of Pi. inf. and Hif. impf. There must have arisen later confusion of the two conjugations.—4. הבמה הנהלה: Gr., *ψηλοστατη κ. μεγαλη*, paraphrasing the obnoxious words, and so all VSS (℣ 'excelsum magnum'), exc. that ℔ replace the noun with 'altar.'—5. The nominal sentence without conj. appears awkward; VSS, exc. ℥, attach בנבען to prec. v., and prefix a conj. to the foll. verb.—אלהים: Gr. (exc. Aq., Sym.) = יהוה.—6. הלך לפניך ו': Burn. *cf.* 'walking with God,' Gen. 5²², Mic. 6⁸, etc.—8. לא יבנה ולא יבנה וְיבנה: = 8⁵; ℔ om. the second sentence and also abbreviates the parallel.—9. לשמש את עמך: Gr. *+εν δικαιοσυνη*; St. elides as repetition of the phrase below; but the insistence on justice is to the point.—עמך הבנה: *cf.* Num. 20²⁰; for the sense of the adj. *cf.* the noun כבוד.—10. [בעיני] ארני: read with many MSS יהוה; all VSS with amelioration of the physical phrase: "it pleased the Lord."—11. אלהים: = Ch., but all VSS with יהוה (℔ noting that Hebræus has אלהים).—לך: ℔ om., and so St.; but note the triple 2d person with effect, לך *bis*, אביך.—ושאלה: for the 'irregular' pf. with 'weak Waw' (Ch. corrects to ושאלה) see Dr., *Tenses*, §133; Burn. rightly notes the rhetorical contrast of שאלה and לא שאלה, and we may also observe the earlier larger liberty in the syntax with Waw.—12. כרבריך: so *BH* (L), Bär; Mich., Ken., Ginsb., כרבריך = VSS, exc. ℣; the latter as sing., and by Oriental tradition, is correct; at 18³⁶, 22¹³ רבריך is corrected by Ḳr. to רבריך; the fuller Kt. arose to express the accent.—חכם ונבון: ℔ *φρονιμην κ. σοφην*, but Hex., σ. κ. φ., exemplifying the later understanding of חכם.—13. כל ימך: OGr. om., and so St., *al.*, correctly, unless we are to assume an original bungling phrase; Klost., Benz. preserve by reading preceding היה as יהיה. The gloss was not restrictive in purpose, it would interpret the past tense so as to include the coming life of the king. Ch. expands into comparison with all kings, 'before thee and after thee.' Note punctuation of JV to avoid the difficulty.—15. וקן: preferable to Ginsb., *al.*, correctly; see Bär's note, St. ורבו: Gr. pref. κ. *ανεστη*.—ארן לפני ארן: OGr. pref. *κατα προσωπον τ. θυσιαστηριου τ. [κατα προς.]*,

accepted by Then., Klost., but an addition after Ch., v. 6, with Burn., "to remove the impression that S. passed into the immediate presence of the Ark."—אֵרִי: Ken. text, many MSS, the original יהיה. Grr. add 'in Sion,' and the plus 'for himself [and all his servants].'

16. חֲבָנָה: Grr., *ωφθησαν*—by euphemistic change (?); $\mathfrak{C}=\mathfrak{H}$.— \mathfrak{C} : =Engl. indefinite 'certain'; for the same use cf. \mathfrak{C} 11¹⁸, 17⁹, Jud. 4¹, 19¹, and Aram. נִבְרִין, Dan. 3⁸; 3 Heb. MSS, Grr. om.— \mathfrak{C} : 6 Gr. MSS *πονηραι* for *πορναι*, 1 MS om.—17. בִּי: EVV 'Oh'; Grr., *εν εμοι*; \mathfrak{S} לִי = 'chez moi'; \mathfrak{T} בְּבִעֵי, 'at your leave, pray'= \mathfrak{S} \mathfrak{A} \mathfrak{Y} ; on such an understanding, cf. the suppression of \mathfrak{C} of the root בִּיעַ in *nn. pr.*, e.g., רִוּה, בִּלְדֵד. But A. M. Honeyman, in a notable article in *JAOS* 1944, 81 f., properly insists, following predecessors, but with additional proof, on its identification with אָבִי, II. 5¹³ (*q.v.*), and from root אָבַה, 'be willing,' and so becoming a worn-down expression for 'granted,' and the like.—18. יְחִידוֹ: 'alone'; the Heb. and the Engl. adv. by like development.— \mathfrak{C} 10¹; \mathfrak{S} \mathfrak{C} om., and so St. שְׁחִים אֲחֵנוּ: cf. שְׁחִים אֲחֵנוּ, 1 Sam. 20¹².—20. וְאֶחָד יִשְׁנָה: \mathfrak{S} \mathfrak{C} om., and so St.— \mathfrak{C} : Grr., *εκ τ. αγκαλων μου*, reading as *שְׁחִים*.—21. בְּבִקֵר: 20¹; \mathfrak{Y} distinguishes from 10¹ with 'clara luce'; St., *BH* om.—22. לֹא בִי: see Note, 2³⁰.— \mathfrak{C} : וְאֵת אֶחָד לֹא בִי בְּקֵר הִמָּת וּבְנֵי הַחַיִּים.—and so St., *BH*, *Eissf.*; but the repetition belongs to the style.—25. \mathfrak{C} *ad fin.* plus *κ. το τεθνηκος ομοιως διελετε κ. οστε αμφοτεrais*, and so Jos.; see Rahlfs, *SS* 3, 101, 284, questioning whether the addition was by oral tradition or from an early written source.—26. יְלִידוֹ: also v. 27. St. doubts the change of vocalization from \mathfrak{C} , but here 2 Gr. MSS have *παιδαριον vs. current παιδιον* and so 2 Lucianic MSS at v. 27, proving that the distinction was early observed. The noun is always used of the mother's relation, יְלִידוֹ, *Job* 14¹, etc., exc. 1 Ch. 14⁴.— \mathfrak{C} \mathfrak{C} om., and so at v. 27; 2 Heb. MSS om. it here, a third MS om. it v. 27.—27. לֹא תִשְׁחָתוּ: positive command, *vs.* the precativ of the woman's plea with \mathfrak{A} ; some 66 MSS read the latter.—Rahlfs presents (*SS* 1, §3) a study of the text of Origen's letter to Julius Africanus, repeating the above story.

CC. 4–5¹⁴ (EVV ch. 4). The power and glory of king Solomon. V. 1 is editorial, but primary, and is based upon 2 Sam. 8^{15a}, "and David reigned over all Israel," while *ib.* v. 15^b, "and David was effecting justice and right for all his people," is paralleled by the story of Solomon's Judgment; then Sam., vv. 16^{ff.}, lists David's officialdom, even as the like data are given here. *All Israel*: *i.e.*, Pan-Israel, an early nationalistic term from the days of the union of the tribes in a kingdom.

VV. 2–6. A list of the royal cabinet. The accompanying plate gives a conspectus of the textual evidence for this list

of offices and officers. It is an expansion of the table in the writer's article, 'The Year-Eponymate in the Hebrew Monarchy,' *JBL* 1930, 311-19, to which reference should be made for fuller demonstrations. Similar tables have been presented by Benzinger (p. 15) and Šanda (p. 71). For \mathfrak{G} the text of B is followed, with notable variants in parentheses. Recognition of the 'glosses' in Gr. ch. 2 and of their proper assignment is of prime importance; their original order is indicated by (1), (2), (3), etc. A similar table will be given on next page presenting the parallelism of the present list with those of David's officers, 2 Sam. 8, 20.

The resultant of criticism of the text is the following form.
2. *And these were his officers: Azariah b. Sadok (3) Over-the-Year; and Ahijah b. Shausha, Secretary; and Jehoshaphat b. Ahilud [var. Ahilad] the Recorder; (4a) and Benaiah b. Jehoiada Over-the-Army; (5) and Azariah b. Nathan Over-the-Lieutenants; and Zabud [var. Zakur] b. Nathan Priest, Royal Friend; (6) and Ahiel [var. Ahishar—without patronymic] Over-the-Palace; and Adoram [Adoniram?] b. Abda Over-the-Levy.*

The most important reconstruction of the text occurs in the first and second items, namely with omission of 'the priest' after 'Sadok' (in any case the appositive should refer to the son Azariah), the correction of the unexplained *n. pr.*, 'Elihoreph' to 'Over-the-Year,' following a Gr. gloss, and the resultant of but one Secretary. In the first item 'the priest' is lacking in \mathfrak{G} here, but is supplied in 2^{46b}, which latter section otherwise ignores any Priests in the list. The item in v.⁴ on the two Priests was baldly introduced from the list of David's officers in 2 Sam. 8^{16ff.} (see Comm., 2^{35b}); it has a most unauthentic ring, as Abiathar was immediately deposed upon the king's accession, indeed should have been named first; we learn below of a Priest in the royal court, who is also Royal Friend.¹ But a certain Azariah b. Sadok

¹ In note 10 of his article cited above the writer has expressed his scepticism concerning these data about Sadok. Only brief reference may be made to the extensive recent literature on the subject of the Aaronids and Sadokids: Kittel, *GVI* 2, 196; Kennett, *O.T. Essays*, ch. 3; Meek, *AJSL* 45 (1929), 149 ff.; J. Gabriel, *Untersuchungen über das alttest. Hohepriestertum* (1933); arts. by Bentzen, Budde, Möhlenbrink in *ZAW* 1933, 173 ff.; 1934, 42 ff., 184 ff.; Morgenstern,

I.	II.	III.	IV.	V.
<p>פד I. 4²⁻⁶ עזריהו בן צדוק הבן אליהו ואהיה בני שישא ספרים יהושפט בן אחיזר הכזיר הבניו בן יהודע על הצבא וצדוק ואביתר כהנים ועזריהו בן נתן על הכבים והודו בן נתן כהן רעה הפלך ואחישר על הבית</p>	<p>Ⓢ <i>in loco</i> אֲזַרְיָהוּ וְיֹסֵף צְדֻקָה — (Ⓢ II o <i>ieruus</i>) κ. Αχεία υιος (MN + 16 MSS υιοι) Σαββα (Ⓢ Susa, Ⓢ Σοββα) γρμμματαεις (3 MSS—<i>teus</i>) κ. Ιωσαφάθ υ. Αχειλιαδ (N Αχιλλαδ) υπομμμησκαων κ. Σαδουκ κ. Αβιαθαρ <i>ierus</i> κ. Ουρνια υ. Ναθαν επι τ. καθεστημενων κ. Ζαβουθ υ. Ναθαν εταυρος του βασιλευως κ. Αχערη (—) οικονομος κ. Ελιαβ ο οικονομος κ. Αδωνειρα υ. Ναφ επι τ. πατριας κ. Αδωνειρα υ. Εδραμ επι τ. φερων</p>	<p>Ⓢ 248b (1) Αζαριου υιος Σαδωκ του <i>ierews</i> (4) κ. Σοιβα (Ⓢ Σουσα) γρμμματαεις (5) κ. Βασα (ναγτ. Σαβα, Σοιβα) υ. Αχειθαλαμ αναμμμησκαων (6) κ. Αβει (ναγ. Αβια, Ⓢ Ελιαβ) υ. Ιωαβ (ναγ. Ιωαδ) αρχιστρατηγος (2) κ. Ουρειου υ. Ναθαν αρχων τ. εφεστηκωτων (10) κ. Καχουρ (B³, all others Z—) ο συμβουλος (3) κ. Εδραμεν επι τ. οικον αυτου</p>	<p>Ⓢ (Lagarde) <i>in loco</i> Αζαριου υιος Σαδδουκ κ. Βλιαβ κ. Αχια υιος Σαφάτ γρμμματαεις κ. Ιωσαφάτ υ. Αχθιθαλαμ υπομμμησκαων κ. Βενας υ. Ιωαδ επι τ. δυναμειως κ. Σαδδουκ κ. Αβιαθαρ <i>ierus</i> κ. Ουρνια υ. Ναθαν επι τ. καθεστημενων κ. Ζαχουρ υ. Ναθαν εταυρος τ. βασιλευως κ. Αχθηλ οικονομος κ. Ελιαβ υ. Ιωαβ επι τ. στρατίας κ. Αδωνειραμ υ. Εδραμ επι τ. φερων</p>	<p>Ⓢ (8) επι τ. αυλαρχίας (9) κ. επι τ. πλιυθιου (7) κ. Αχερε (ναγτ. Αχειραμ, —καμ) υ. Εδραμ επι τ. αρσεις</p>

is Over-the-Year, the ranking officer, doubtless of priestly function. The word *hōreḥ* in the unexplained *n. pr.*, 'Elihorep,' as hitherto understood, means the autumn season, S. Arab. *ḥrḥ* (cf. Arab. *ḥarīf*, 'autumn'), the beginning of the ancient Semitic year, that is, the New Year. The word *ḥrḥ* was then used for the calendar year, of which a *kabīr*, generally two *kabīrs* (cf. the Roman consuls), had charge. The office was parallel to that of the Ass. *līmu*, after the years of which functionaries all official documents were dated. It has been disputed among South-Arabists whether the office was sacerdotal, but there is proof of this in certain cases.² And indeed the Israelite office of *kōhēn* was not necessarily sacerdotal, for only so can be explained the statement of 2 Sam. 8¹⁸ that two sons of David were 'priests' (a title that the EVV dodge!), while 2 Sam. 20²⁶ records a certain Jairite, 'a priest of David's.' Now the Gr. at the former place translates the Heb. with ἀλάρχαι, and the gloss in col. iv of the table has over against כַּרְתָּ the same translation ἐπὶ τ. ἀλαρχίας, 'over the palace-service.' The interpretation offered for *ḥrḥ* is entirely satisfactory, but it was suggested to the writer and enforced by the Gr. gloss to the word, ἐπὶ τ. πλιθίου. The plinthion was the quadrans (whence Engl. 'quadrant'), which was not only a sun-dial but also an instrument for determining the seasons by the length of the sun's shadow, the instrument being adjusted to the latitude. To the references for this ancient instrument, long surviving in the Arabic world, given in the writer's article cited, are to be added two cases of Arabian quadrants: CIS IV, no. 161, Nabataean; Jaussen and Savignac, *Mission Archéologique* (1909), vol. I, fig. 113, p. 303, a N. Arabian specimen. Cf. comment on sun-dials, II. 20^{8ff.} There is thus evidence for a fixed legal

'The High-Priesthood,' *AJSL* 55 (1938), 1 ff.; J. Hoschander, *The Priests and Prophets*, ch. 6. For identification of Sadok as of the old Canaanite priesthood in Jerusalem, proposed by Mowinckel, Bentzen, and independently by H. H. Rowley, see the latter's art., 'Zadok and Nehushtan,' *JBL* 1939, 115 ff., with full review of the literature. It is suggested that the name of the priest may be historically related to that of the early priest-king of Jerusalem, Melchi-sedek. See also *Comm.*, 2^{35b}, §14^{ff.}.

² See note 7 of the writer's art. cited; add citations in Glossary of Conti Rossini, *Chrest.*, p. 245, col. a, proving the priestly function.

calendar at the beginning of the Israelite monarchy. We may properly infer that this institution came to involve the registration of important events by dates, as in the ancient Mesopotamian empires, and so subsequently throughout the Mediterranean world. The Officer-over-the-Year was counterpart of the Roman Pontifex Maximus. It is from such official calendars that the dated data scattered throughout our book were ultimately drawn. For the syntactically unique use of 'al, 'over x,' here and below, cf. the instances cited in BDB 755a; cf. the correspondent Akk. *ša pān, ša eli*; and for the later Gr. equivalent, ἐπι with the gen., see Thayer, *Lex.*, 231^b.

After this titularly ranking officer comes the Scribe or Secretary. The Heb. word *sōpēr* has been understood as corresponding to Akk. *šāperu*, on which office Meissner remarks that it was 'one of the most frequent, but also most ambiguous offices'; but R. P. Dougherty, with philological correctness, relates it to simple Akk. *sepēru*, 'scribe.'³ In the Israelite *ménage* there was one such officer *par excellence*, e.g., II. 22⁸, etc. The title 'Recorder,' by usual translation, is ambiguous, alongside of 'Scribe.' The Heb. word demands rather the translation (the king's) 'Remembrancer,' as Benzinger, Driver, Šanda, suggest.⁴ For the 'Lieutenants' (EVV 'chief, principal officers') cf. 5³⁰. In 'Zabud b. Nathan Priest and Royal Friend' we have a case of the wide use of the first title (cf. preceding paragraph). The other, 'Royal Friend,' was Egyptian (A. Wiedemann, *Gesch. von altem Aegypten*, 1891, 63, Erman-Ranke, *Aegypten u. aegyptisches Leben*, 85), appears in early Canaan, Gen. 26²⁶, and in South Arabia (*mwdt* in construction with the king's name, Conti Rossini, *Chrest.*, 134); it was also an Ethiopian title

³ Meissner, *Bab. u. Ass.*, I, 133; Dougherty, *JAOS* 1928, 109 ff. See GB and Bezold, *BAG*, sub *vv*. For the Egyptian scribe and his high position see Erman, *Lit. of the Anc. Egyptians*, p. xxvii. and at length J. Begrich, 'Sōfēr und Mazkīr,' *ZAW* 17 (1940), 1 ff.

⁴ One Gr. translation, ἀναμνησκων, gives this mng.; the variant parallel word is in line with the common ὑπομνήματα, 'memoranda, minutes'; at 1 Ch. 18¹⁵ the word is translated with ὑπομνηματογράφος, title of a high officer at Alexandria, according to Strabo (xvii, 1, 12). For possible Old Egyptian correspondents see Bertholet, *Hist. of Heb. Civilization*, 247, and Gressmann, I, 212, the latter noting the Narrator of the Egyptian court.

(ZA 30, 6). Hushai was 'friend' of David (2 Sam. 15³⁷), and the title has been found by some at 1⁸.

The officer 'Over-the-House,' *i.e.*, royal Chamberlain, Major-domo, ranks low in the present list; at II. 18¹⁸ he precedes the Scribe and the Recorder, and the title was borne by Jotham as his father's regent (II. 15⁵), as also by Obadiah, Ahab's chief minister (18³); the intimate office doubtless advanced in importance, like that of the later European chamberlain. For the title in a Lachish letter see Comm., II. 25^{22ff.} The office corresponds to that of the Bab. *muzaz ēkallim*, the Ass. *ša pān ēkalli* (Meissner, pp. 120, 131), and the late Bab. *ša eli bitāni* (Dougherty, *AASOR* 5 [1924], 40 ff.). For the form of the title *cf.* that of the mayor, 'Over-the-City,' II. 10⁵. There is finally the 'Levy Officer,' in charge of the *corvée*; *cf.* 5²⁸. We learn of this unpopular incumbent's fate in ch. 12. In this connexion is to be noted Mendelsohn's very thorough treatment in his article on 'State Slavery,' cited in the Bibliography.

In regard to the historical character of this list, it is unnecessary, as with Benzinger, to hold that the variant textual authorities represent lists of different epochs. But a problem lies in the relation of the present list to those of David's officers in 2 Sam. 8^{16ff.} and 20^{28ff.} The parallelisms appear as follows:

I. 2 Sam. 8	II. 2 Sam. 20	III. 1 Ki. 4
Joab b. Zeruah over the host	(1) Joab over all the host of Israel	Azariah b. Sadok over the year
Jehoshaphat b. Ahilud recorder	(4) Jehosh. b. Ahil. recorder	Ahijah b. Shausha scribe
Sadok b. Ahitub and Ahimelek b. Abiathar priests	(6) Sadok and Abiathar priests	Jehosh. b. Ahilud recorder
Seraiah scribe	(5) Sheva scribe	Benaiah b. Jeh. over the host
Benaiah b. Jehoiada over the Cherethites and Pelethites	(2) Ben. b. Jeh. over C. and P.	Sadok and Abiathar priests
David's sons priests	(3) Adoram over the levy	Azariah b. Nathan over the officers
	(7) The Jairite Ira priest	Ahishar over the house
	(The above items arranged to correspond with col. I.)	Adoniram b. Abda over the levy

Note that in Ki. three names, Azariah b. Sadok, Azariah b. Nathan, Ahishar are independent of the earlier lists. The two priests we have seen reason to exclude; *n.b.* they are not provided with patronymics in 2 Sam. 20 and Ki. For Solomon's accepted reign it would be highly improbable that Adoram/Adoniram, who died after that king, was a minister of David's. There remain only Jehoshaphat b. A. and Benaiah b. J. as ministers in both reigns. We may therefore, with Šanda, assign the list in Ki. to the first half of Solomon's reign. The list in 2 Sam. 8 appears to be authentic, 'unless the priests there are to be excluded; that in 2 Sam. 20 is entirely secondary, except for the original datum of 'the Jairite Ira priest'; 'Sheva' is corruption of 'Shausha' in Ki.

1. כַּל: Grr. om., and so some critics, *e.g.*, St., BH; but the v. is editorial repetition of 2 Sam. 8¹⁵, where 'all Israel' appears; the same political phrase below, v. 7, 12¹.—2. שָׂרִים.—2. שָׂרִים: at its earliest occurrence, Jud. 5¹⁵, the word means 'chieftain'; while it developed in Akk. to the mng., 'king,' the usual tr. as 'prince' is contrary to Israel's simple constitution.—3. אֶל־יְהוָה: read אֶל־יְהוָה, and see Comm. above. For other attempts at etymology see Šanda.—אָחִיה: on a Lachish tablet אָחִיהוּ.—שִׁשָּׁא: read שִׁשָּׁא with 1 Ch. 18¹⁶; the same person's name=Σουσα, 2 Sam. 20²⁵ (of which Β Ιησους is patent corruption), for the deformed Kṛ. of 𐤀; A Σ here Σουσα=𐤀. Σ Σαβα here may be corruption of Σαβσα. [א]שִׁשָּׁא=שִׁשָּׁא, 'sun'; *cf.* the Aram. name נִי שִׁשָּׁא 'like the sun' (CIS II, no. 65), the variation of the labial in שָׁבִים (Is. 3¹⁸), a diminutive=ξυβαις, and the Ugaritic form špš. Brockelmann's section on dissimilation of labials is quite incomplete; but note H. Bauer's art. in ZfS 1935, 11 ff. There is no reason to displace the name with שָׂרִיה, the scribe's name at 2 Sam. 8¹⁷ (*vs.* GB).—אֶחָדִיר (also v. 12): =Gr. h j Αχιλουδ; other Grr. read as אֶחָדִיר, for which *cf.* names signifying divine procreation, *e.g.*, בְּנֵי־יְהוָה, and Akk. forms with *bānū*. The variant Αχιθαλαμ, supporting 𐤀, is a play upon our word; the second element=J. Aram. הַלְבָא, 'twin,' *i.e.*, 'a brother-is-born'='twin-brother.'—4. הַצֶּבֶא . . . בְּנֵיהוּ: B v a, C om.; St. prefers the novel 'Eliab b. Joab' of 𐤀, 2^{46b}; but for prob. invention of this name see below on אֶחָדִיר.—5. עוֹרֵיהוּ: Grr., Ορπειον, Ορπιας, the word read as אֶחָדִיר, inducing the usual transcription.—הַנְּעִבִים: see Note, v. 7.—וְנֹדֶר: the name also at Ezr. 8¹⁴ Kt., *n. fem.* וְנֹדֶר, II. 23³⁶ Kṛ. The root='to give,' is used in Aram. and S. Arab names. For the name in Ezr. Kṛ. reads וְנֹדֶר, and so here 12 MSS Ken., deR., which rdg. is supported here by 𐤀 (also 𐤀 1 MS, 𐤀), and at 2^{46b} by all Grr. There appear to have been cross-currents of tradition.—בְּנֵי־: 𐤀 𐤀 om., 𐤀 𐤀 ✕; the double title is indeed remarkable.—רָעָה: for abnormal final

vowel see BL 388. The word was found by some in Amarna tablet no. 288, *rūhi šarri*, but the vocalization is contradictory; the word = רֹחֵ 'shepherd'; cf. II. 3⁴.—6. אֲחִישַׁר עַל הַבַּיִת: the name is quite uncertain (corrections proposed by Noth, p. 189, n. 5), and absence of patronymic is unique in this list. B *al.*, Αχχει ην οικονομος κ. Ελιακ ο οικονομος, where ην may be error for ηλ, with resultant אֲחִישַׁר, and ש as remainder of the original patronymic. The duplicate phrase is a clumsy variant of the foll. κ. Ελιαβ υιος Σαφ [Ⓞ^L Ιωαβ] επι τ. πατριας, the last word to be corrected with Ⓞ^L to στρατιας (Rahlfs, SS 3, 201). This phrase is an intrusion from Gr. 2^{46h} with Αβει (MS i Αβια = Ⓞ) υιος Ιωαβ (MS i Ιωαδ); the variant Ιωαδ recalls Benaiah's father Jehoiaada, and accordingly Αβει is reduction of 'Abiathar.' There is no reason to reconstruct Ⓞ from the frail Ⓞ , vs. St.—אֲרִיָהּ: = אֲרִיָהּ, 12¹⁸, 2 Sam. 20²⁴. The Gr. here = Ⓞ , in the other cases vary: in Sam. B Αδωνιραμ, *al.* Αδωραμ = Jos.; in the parallel, 2^{46h}, the variant Gr. rdgs. support the shorter form; at 12¹⁸ Ⓞ and Jos. support Ⓞ . As name of the same person אֲרִיָהּ appears, 2 Ch. 10¹⁸ (also name of a Syrian prince, 1 Ch. 18¹⁹, of an Aram. tribe, 1 Ch. 1²¹). Critics generally correct the form at 12¹⁸ after the spelling here; but the rarer pagan Hadoram/Adoram, with the divine element Haddu/Addu, by far deserves preference. We may indeed have merely variant forms in the two names, since 'ādōn is development of 'ad, 'father,' as appears from Ugaritic texts; see H. Ginsberg, *OLz.*, 1934, 473, and Cook, *CAH* 3, 349, who had earlier made the identification.—עֲבָרָא: on a Samarian ostracon, and in Phoenician (Harris, *Gram.*, Glossary); amazing Gr. variations, e.g., Β Εφρα, Ⓞ^L Εδραμ = Εδραει 2^{46h}, the two latter forms explaining the preceding remarkable gloss in the same v., κ. εδραμεν επι τ. οικον αυτου.—סֵבַע: for the etymology as = S. Arab. *ms̄*, 'levy,' see Montg., *JQR* 25 (1934), 267.

VV.⁷⁻¹⁹. Solomon's districting of his kingdom and the respective lieutenants. For recent discussions of this administrative list see Alt, *Israels Gaue unter Salomo*, and Albright, 'The Administrative Divisions of Israel and Judah,' *JPOS* 1925, 17 ff., with map; for subsequent exchange of opinion between these two scholars see Alt, *Pjb.*, 1925, 100 ff., Albright, *ZAW* 1926, 225 ff. For the geography there are further to be noted Jack, *Samaria in Ahab's Time*, ch. 3, with map; Alt, *Die Staatenbildung der Israeliten in Palästina*; Robinson, *HI* 1, 263 ff., with map; Abel, *GP* 2, 79 ff., with map. For the commentators see especially Kittel and Šanda. For the place-names in the list are to be consulted Döllner, *GES*; Borée, *AOP* vol. 2; Galling, *BR*. For Beth-shean see the extensive monograph by A. Rowe, *Topography and History of Beth-shan* (1930); for Beth-shemesh, E. Grant, *Beth Shemesh*

(1929); for Megiddo see Comm., 9¹⁵, for Sarethan, *ib.* 7¹⁶; for the Transjordan domain A. Bergman, 'The Israelite Occupation of Eastern Palestine,' etc., *JAOS* 1934, 169 ff., and 'The Israelite Tribe of Half-Manasseh,' *JPOS* 1936, 224 ff. Important topographical reviews and discussions for Palestine and the neighbouring lands by Albright are listed in the *Indexed Bibliography* of his publications, pp. 3-18. Of illuminating comparative interest is R. P. Dougherty's presentation of 'Cuneiform Parallels to Solomon's Provisioning System,' *AASOR* 5 (1925), with several illustrative plates.¹

7. *And Solomon had twelve Lieutenants over all Israel, that they might provision the king and his household; for a month in the year it lay upon each one to make provision.* 'Lieutenant' (in the old English sense—Kittel, 'Pasha,' Albright, 'Prefect') corresponds to the Ass. *šakēn/šaknu*; for a political comparison with this list from the Assyrian quarter see E. Forrer, *Die Provinzeinteilung des ass. Reiches* (1919). It is notable that there is no alignment with the Twelve Tribes (as 'according to the number of the tribes,' e.g., 18³¹); the economic reason alone is given, the monthly allotment among the twelve divisions for payment of the royal dues. Such an apportionment was as a matter of bookkeeping; the income could have been paid in kind or money, according to the seasons. For itemization of the impost *cf.* 5^{2ff.}. A caricature of this 12-month system as for David's reign appears in 1 Ch. 27¹⁻¹⁵, with a subsequent list of twelve officers over David's budget, vv. 25^{ff.}. The number has been explained by Noth as arising from the ancient twelve-tribe Amphictyony, with each member obligated for definite supplies in a definite month, *Das System der Zwölf Stämme Israels*, esp. pp. 85 ff.

An accident early befell the document, a vertical break at the right hand of the papyrus (?) left blank the initial names in vv. 8-11, with a further blank in v. 13. In v. 12 there has been some shuffling of the geographical data; in vv. 13. 19^a some glosses have been added.

¹ For identification of Abel-Meholah and Sarethan there is now to be added the study by Glueck, cited in n. 1 to 7^{40ff.}, and further on the former place *BASOR* 91, 15 ff. Also is to be noted his fresh identification of much mooted Ramoth-Gilead (see Comm., 22²) with Tell Rāmit, presented in *BASOR* 92 (1943), 10 ff.

8. *And these are their names :*

- I. — *b. Hur : in Highland of Ephraim.*
- II. 9. — *b. Deker : in Makas [?] and in [? - or Be-?] Shaalvim and Beth-shemesh and Ayyalon [D Elon] and [so MSS] Beth-hanan.*
- III. 10. — *b. Hesel : in Arubboth ; his Socho and all the land of Hephher.*
- IV. 11. — *b. Abinadab : all Naphath-Dor.—Solomon's daughter Taphath became his wife.*
- V. 12. *Baana b. Ahilud : Taanach and Megiddo [the following are transpositions] :*
 (4) *to beyond Jokmeam, (1) and all Beth-shean*
 (3) *below Jezreel, from Beth-shean (2) as far as Abel-meholah, which is near Sarethan.*
- VI. 13. — *b. Geber : in || 19a. Geber b. Uri : in the land of Gilead [gloss land of Ramoth of Gilead. Sihon king of the Amorites and Og king of Bashan].*
 [gloss *his the Camps of Jair b. Manasseh*] *his the district of Argob*
 [gloss *which is in Bashan, sixty great cities with walls and bronze bars*].
- VII. 14. *Ahinadab b. Iddo : Mahanaim.*
- VIII. 15. — *b. Ahimaas : in Naphthali.—He too married Bosmath Solomon's daughter.*
- IX. 16. *Baana b. Hushai : in Asher and Bealoth [?].*
- X. 17. *Jehoshaphat b. Paruah : in Issachar.*
- XI. 18. *Shimei b. Ela : in Benjamin.*
- XII. 19b. *And one lieutenant, He-in-the-Land.*

The problem at once arises as to the allocation of the twelve districts. Twelve districts are distinguished, plus 'one lieutenant in the land.' This item has been from of old interpreted as 'over the (whole) land'; or the word 'Judah' has been taken from the beginning of the next v., but this would give thirteen lieutenants, and accordingly the item is largely elided as a gloss (see at length Notes below). And it is held by many critics, e.g., Kittel, Šanda, Alt, Robinson, that 'All Israel' means simply the North. Pan-Israel would

then have remained theoretically a separate kingdom, combined with Judah under one crown—*cf.* the union of England and Scotland. On this basis might be explained the non-mention of the officer's name in v.^{19b}, if 'Judah' is to be interpolated there. The logical result is to regard v.^{19b} as a gloss. However Albright (in his first article, pp. 26 ff.) acutely points a way out of the difficulty. V.¹³, 'b. Geber in Ramoth of Gilead,' as he shows, pairs with 'Geber b. Uri in the land of Gilead,' v.^{19a} (*n.b.* repetition of 'Geber' and 'Gilead'); they are literally identical, despite the attempt of scholars, *e.g.*, Kittel, Stade, Šanda, to correct 'Gilead' 2° to 'Gad' after G; but the Greek desired to avoid the duplicate for the same reason that impels modern scholars. The officer for the district including Gad was the one at Mahanaim, v.¹⁴, which was Gadite (*cf.* Josh. 21³⁸, etc.). And so, with but one Gileadite province surviving, we require a twelfth item, which is represented by the 'lieutenant' in v.^{19b}. In this case 'All Israel' included Judah. The ancient interpretation of this official is as of a superior over the twelve lieutenants; so Jos., *Ant.*, viii, 2, 3, ἐπὶ δὲ τούτων εἰς πάλιν ἄρχων ἀποδέδεικτο, and so Rashi (identifying the person with Azariah, v.⁵), Kimchi; \mathfrak{V} \mathfrak{S} \mathfrak{A} variously and curiously alter the obscure statement. Klostermann proposed a corresponding change of text, which has been favourably regarded by Benzinger, Burney, and so JV interpolates. Thenius understood the phrase in continuation as a statement of surprise, 'just one lieutenant in that (great) land (of Gilead)' (*cf.* \mathfrak{V} 'super omnia quæ erant in illa terra'); he was followed by Kittel, but reading 'Gad' in place of 'Gilead.' But with acceptance of Albright's criticism it is necessary to find the twelfth lieutenant here, and indeed Judah must have been included. The simplest solution, following the Grr., has appeared to some to be the detachment of 'Judah' from v.²⁰, reading here 'land of Judah'; others suppose the loss of the word here by haplog. with the following same word (so Stade). But the problem is solved, and without text-correction, by maintaining that the Judæan archivist used the expression 'in the land' in a domestic, provincial sense as of the royal province of Judah. This phrase for the home-land appears at 9¹⁸, concerning Judæan 'Tamar-in-the-Steppe in the Land.' And for a very much

later age Torrey discovers the usage in Acts 11²⁸, in the prophecy uttered in the Christian Church at Antioch that there would be a famine ἐφ' ὅλην τὴν οἰκουμένην, which nominal phrase translates original Aram. כּל ארץ, 'all the land' (misunderstood as 'all the earth'), *i.e.*, Judæa—there was no such universal famine at that time (*Composition and Date of Acts*, HTS 1 [1916], 20 ff.). Also the exact parallel to such official designation appears in the Ass. *šakēn ina māti*, *i.e.*, the governor of the home-province of Assyria; see Forrer, *Provinzeinteilung*, 7, and for the high rank of this officer in the empire the plate opposite p. 6. There is also the common expression for the king's remaining 'at home,' *ina māti*, *e.g.*, Rogers, *CP* 226 ff., *n.b.* p. 234. The 'one lieutenant' is in contrast to the many in North Israel; he is unnamed, and may have been only a functionary in the royal chancellery.

A common modern judgment upon Solomon's creation of these administrative districts is expressed by Lods (*Israël*, 430): "S. a voulu—comme la Constituante en 1790—briser les cadres de la vie provinciale autonome," and by Olmstead (*HPS* 342): "Solomon had no need to flatter tribal susceptibilities." But the studies of Alt and Albright recognize that in general the partition respected the older tribal lines, which after all were fairly vague. Alt's brilliant identification (in *Israel's Gaue*) of Socho (v.¹⁰) dismisses two Judæan towns of the same name, and finds it in modern Shuwēkah at exit into the plain of the road from Shechem to the sea (indicated in the Survey Map). Arubboth, *i.e.*, modern 'Arrabeh (so Albright), 11 miles NE of Shuwēkah is named along with Hopher, a Manassite clan; the latter identification has been uncertain; on ground of occurrence of Hopher and Arubboth on a Samaritan tablet, it may be identified with Hafireh, 2 miles E of Arubboth (Jack, *Samaria*, 79). With this Manassite division defined we obtain a systematic order: A. Central Israel: (1) the Ephraimite Hill-country; (2) the old Danite land (with Makes unidentified); (3) Manasseh; (4) Naphth-Dor, the coastal district between Phœnicia and Philistia, probably a recent acquisition and requiring distinct administration; (5) the strategic E-W series of depressions, commonly known as Esdraelon—here no tribe is named; B. Transjordan: (6), with combination of vv.^{13, 19a}, East Manasseh,

i.e., North Gilead (for Ramoth, see Comm., 22²); (7) South Gilead, the Biblical Gad; C. North Israel: (8) Naphtali; (9) Asher; (10) Issachar; D. the South: (11) Benjamin; (12) Judah. Of the above only (2), (4), (5) represent fresh political geography. As Alt suggests, the naming of several cities in (2) and (5) may indicate a certain autonomy preserved by non-Israelite communes; *n.b.* the term 'all Beth-shean.' Of particular personal interest are the references to the matrimonial alliances of two of the lieutenants with the royal house (vv.^{11. 15}); the archival document was accompanied with such personal data.

For a study of the Gr. variants in this section see Rahlfs, *SS* 3, 224-39.—7. נַצִּיבִים: pointed as Nif. ppl., as at v.⁵, 5⁷, and so understood by Grr., καθεστამενοι, *vs.* distinction of נַצִּיב, v.¹⁹, by transliteration; but 9 MSS here נַצִּיבִים and, with Šanda, this nominal form is to be preferred, in parallel with נַצִּיב below; the ancient scribes followed the rule of paucity in spelling, נַצִּיב, but נַצִּיבִים; like variation in 22¹⁸.—יִכְלִיבִי=5⁷; Grr. as though יִכְלִיבִי, which St. prefers.—אֲחֵר: ἄλλοι=many MSS, Grr.; but the article is not necessary, *vs.* Burn.; *cf.* 1 Sam, 13¹⁷, etc.—8. "These their names": the same introductory phrase 2 Sam. 23⁸, and in the Elephantine papp., Cowley, nos. 22, 34, 66.—חֹר: a general Sem. name; of a Calebite (1 Ch. 2¹⁹), a Midianite king (Num. 31⁸), in an Aram. inscription (*CIS* II, no. 140), in S. Arab. (Ryckmans, *NPS* 2, 58), and in such cases not Egyptian as='Horus.'—After the several items the Grr. add irregularly εἶς (=אֶחָד), 7 identical cases in B and Luc., plus 2 in Luc.; see Rahlfs's full discussion of the Gr. evidence, pp. 235-9, with the inference that 'one' is an irregularly interpolated word; but actually it is an archaic survival, preserved irregularly. The check appears throughout the list of kings in Jos. 12^{9a}; *cf.* a list of names in an Elephantine pap., Cowley, no. 33, occurring after 'X his name,' with which *cf.* the checking system by strokes in nos. 22, 81. Add to these instances the Ugaritic tablet, Dhorme, no. 29, *RB* 1931, 54, in which two surviving names are followed by אֲחֵר. The tiresome check came to be omitted sporadically in ultimate use.—9. דָּקָר: for identity with the root דָּקָר see Montg. *JQR* 25 (1935), 264; *cf.* דָּקָר, II. 9²⁵; the *n. p.* is identical with the royal name in the Zakar inscription.—דִּקְוֹן: Grr., Μαχ(ε)μας, by erroneous identification with Michmash; see Abel, *GP* 2, 377, and for possible identification with *Mhs* in Thutnose III's list, the opposite views of Alt, p. 10, and Albright, p. 27.—דָּבָרִיבִים: so the noun at Jud. 1³⁵, but Jos. 19⁴² דָּבָרִיבִין; the word=Akk. šēlabu/šēlabbu, 'fox.' 𐎗 𐎗 have an interesting phonetic transcription with θαλαμει(ν), *cf.* Arab. ṭalab, 'fox,' which etymology is recognized at Jud. 1³⁵

with *al* ἀλώπηκες. The prep., lacking in \mathfrak{L} , is represented in \mathfrak{S} (B a₂ = \mathfrak{C}) with Βη[θαλαμειν], as though *bêl*, 'house' were in mind; and this was carried over into Hex. texts in expanded form with Βηθσαλαβιμ. For the final syllable of the place-name see Note on Shomeron, 16²⁴. For identification see GB, Abel, *GP* 2, 438. St. would read 'ש ל' in parallelism; or ב might be omitted with \mathfrak{L} ; but there is no uniformity in the list.—אילן: St. follows Bār's abbreviated Kt., אלן, which has no support in MSS and other edd. OGrr. support קר., and so \mathfrak{S} , but \mathfrak{G}^H \mathfrak{A} read the word as אילן, as at Josh. 19⁴³, Jud. 1³⁵ (in the same geographical connexion), and so to be read here.—בית חנן: so \mathfrak{T} \mathfrak{S} \mathfrak{A} ; but read with 11 MSS 'ח 'וב; the Grr. observed the asyndeton and inserted εως, which Kit., Burn., St., *BH* unnecessarily accept as for original ער.—For vv. 10. 11^a the Grr. give a barbarous gibberish; Rahlfs finds in general only transliteration.—10. חסר: a name-element found only in חסריה and יושב חסר (?), sons of Zerubbabel, 1 Ch. 3²⁰; the element also in S. Arab. names (*NPS* 1, 96), but not with the editor's interpretation as 'envieux,' after literary Arabic, but in the N. Sem. sense.—שנה: cf. שנה in a jar stamp, *IAE* 143.—חפר: A M N *al.*, *Οφερ* = \mathfrak{S}^H , and so B (corrupt here) at Josh. 12²⁷; \mathfrak{S} \mathfrak{A} = \mathfrak{H} .—11. נפת דאר: see G. Dahl, *Materials for the History of Dor* (1915), 21 ff. (noting Sym.'s translation with *παράλια*), Albr. as cited above, p. 26, n. 18, and for a novel interpretation of the name D. W. Thomas, 'Naphath-Dor,' *QS* 1935, 89 ff. For the variants דאר and רר (*e.g.*, Josh. 12²³) an original ppl. form is to be assumed, *dā'ir*, 'encircler.'—נפת: Noth, *IP* 226, as from Aram. root, 'to drop.'—12. Various arrangements of the v. with deletions have been proposed, *e.g.*, by St., *BH*; the tr. above follows Albr.—בענא: the name appears on coins of N. Syrian origin, and poss. in Punic (Lidzb., *HNE* 242); Minæan בען is to be noted (*NPS* 1, 54). It doubtless = בעלענה, with hypocoristic א; cf. בעשא, 15¹⁶, and see Noth, *IP* 40.—בקצום: (*BH* בקצום) = קם עם, 'may (the god) Am take stand'; for similar vowel variations cf. בקצאל, II. 14⁷, *q.v.*—13. רמת: MSS vary here and elsewhere: רמת, רמת, רמת; \mathfrak{S} (B \mathfrak{C}) \mathfrak{L} read as 'Ramath' = \mathfrak{S}^H \mathfrak{S} \mathfrak{A} ; \mathfrak{G}^H = \mathfrak{H} . The variations in nn. *loci* of such formation are constant, *e.g.*, בעלה below and בעלה. With the preservation of original -*l* there came heightening of the preceding vowel for emphasis. At II. 8²⁹ the simple form appears; for discussion see Borée, *AOP* 43-9.—בניער . . . לו חת, which OGrr. om., and בניער—חמת are patent borrowings from Dt. 3¹⁴, Josh. 13³⁰, etc. The same indictment is to be made against 'land of Sihon . . . Bashan,' v. 19. For 'Hawthoth-Jair' and 'Argob' cf. the correction of \mathfrak{H} at II. 15²⁵.—14. כחניה: the terminative acc. in popular speech usurped the absolute form—cf. 'Stamboul'; see Meek, *JBL* 40, 292.—15. בשמת: doubtless with root-mng., 'fragrant,' *e.g.*, Arab. *bašām* is used of a fragrant shrub. The name as *Bšmt* occurs in S. Arab., but is wrongly interpreted by Ryckmans (*NPS* 1, 56).—16. חש;

possibly David's Friend, and so Ahimaas in v.¹⁵ has been identified by some with Sadok's son; see 2 Sam. 15^{27, 32}.—בִּאֲשֶׁר וּבִעֲלֹת; or the second vocable to be read וּבִנְעִלֹת. Bealoth occurs as a place-name in Judah (Josh. 15²⁴). But collocation of a tribe-name with that of an unknown town is surprising. Ⓞ Ⓞ^L om. 'in Asher and.' Klost., with favourable opinion from Burn., Alt, Albr., conjectures an original 'Asher and Zebulon,' but could this expected rdg. have been so wilfully changed? Following rdgs. of Ⓞ, B Μααλα, A Μααλωτ, Then. suggested recovering כַּעֲלִיֹם = 'ascents,' and finding in it the Ladder of Tyre, Κλίμαξ Τύρου (1 Mac. 10⁵⁹, etc.), Jos. also rdg. here τ. περι Αρκην (i.e., Ακκην?) with further rectification to עַר כַּעֲלִיֹם צַר. Šanda, Eissf. (cf. BH) accept this identification; for contradiction see St.'s extensive note, leaving the word with a question-mark, which is wisest.—17. פִּיחָה : cf. S. Arab. *Pyh* (NPS 1, 180), with root = 'to be at rest.'—19. אַרִי : Gr., Αδ(δ)αι, etc.; cf. the names אַרִי, אַרִיָּה, on which latter see Montg., *JAOS* 1935, 94.—נִלְעָר : Ⓞ (B Ⓞ) Ⓞ^L 'Gad'; Burn. prefers Ⓞ, Šanda accepts Ⓞ, St. is uncertain.—וְנָצַב אַהֲרַי אֲשֶׁר בְּאֲרִיץ; see Comm. BH presents three of the suggested alterations; Šanda brackets the whole half-verse, 'land of Sihon,' etc., as secondary; Eissf. om. the present phrase as 'nicht klar.'

4²⁰⁻⁵14 (AV EVV 4²⁰⁻³⁴).¹ A miscellany: Solomon's might and wisdom. Cf. *Ant.*, viii, 2, 4, 5.

See Int., §1, for the various distinctions of volumes in Gr. Kgdms. Also here after the archival lists above there appeared to be opportunity before the story of the temple, cc. 6 ff., for a *pot-pourri* of material bearing on the reign, much of it duplicated in cc. 9 and 10. Evidently Heb. Kings early underwent transformations, and the Greek *littérateurs* also recognized the nature of the material, and did not hesitate to rearrange here and also to make transference to the Supplement to 2¹⁶. The following list presents the parallelisms:

Ⓞ	Ⓞ ch. 4	Ⓞ ch. 2
4 ²⁰		v. ^{46aβ}
5 ¹		v.v.b. k = 10 ³⁰
5 ^{2, 3}	v.v. ^{22, 23}	v. ^{46e}
5 ⁴	v. ²⁴	v. ^{46f. ga}
5 ⁵		v. ^{46gβ}
5 ⁶ = 10 ²⁶		v. ⁴⁶ⁱ
5 ^{7, 8}	v.v. ^{20, 21}	
5 ⁹⁻¹⁴	v.v. ^{25, 30}	

¹ The chapter divisions in Hebrew printed Bibles = JV, following the Polyglots (as marginally noted in EVV), is contrary to that of Ⓞ and the Protestant translations, which properly distinguish the Hiram story as beginning a fresh chapter, ch. 5.

With the freedom of \mathfrak{G} in rearrangement of this supplementary material no stress is to be laid upon its authority as to text and order.

Ch. 4²⁰-5⁸. Solomon's might. Two editorial essays from different hands sum up the security of the realm. (1) 4²⁰-5¹: *Judah and Israel were many like the sand by the sea for multitude, eating and drinking and enjoying themselves. And Solomon was ruling over all the kingdoms from the River [gloss+the land of Philistia] even to the border of Egypt—they were bringing tribute and serving Solomon all the days of his life. And (2) vv.^{4, 5}: For he had sway over all Across-the-River from Tiphshah (Thapsacus) even to Gaza, over all the kings of Across-the-River; and he had peace on all borders round about. And Judah and Israel dwelt in security, every one under his vine and fig-tree, from Dan to Beersheba, all the days of Solomon.* Of these vv. only v.⁴ is represented in \mathfrak{G} here, but the others were omitted as already given in the Gr. appendix to ch. 2; hence agreement cannot be given to Kittel, who holds that 4²⁰-5¹ was "added by a late editor from 2⁴⁶ of LXX." Each of the above pairs of vv. is followed by a statement on the supplies for the royal *ménage*: vv.^{2, 3} on the supplies for the royal table, vv.⁶⁻⁸ on the table and also the stabling of the horses. But v.⁶, giving the number of the horses, is an insertion with an exaggerated figure (40,000 stalls) from 10²⁶ (*q.v.*), induced by the reference to the stabling in v.⁸. Against the opinion of Kittel and Stade, v.⁷ appears to be quite secondary, repeating 4⁷; there remains as original only v.⁸ on the stabling, as sequence of vv.^{2, 3}. Out of 4²⁰-5⁸ these alone appear to be early items—how authentic there is no saying, although documentary specifications of the royal budget may well have survived. The provisioning of the stables in the chariot cities was a particularly important item; *cf.* 9¹⁹, 10^{26ff.}. The word translated 'straw' is the modern Arab. *tibn*, used of mixed grain and straw, the usual fodder for horses. For the table budget given here may be compared the comparatively small *ménage* of Nehemiah, which required daily 'one ox, six fattened sheep, and fowls' *per diem* for his suite of 150 men and guests (Neh. 5^{17f.}). Most variant estimates have been suggested, as by Thenius, Keil, Šanda (ranging from 14,000 to 32,000 persons); Skinner makes the shrewdest estimate from comparison

with Nehemiah's figures, calculating that the budget provided for 4000-5000 persons, which would include the large families; and Kittel suggests 3000-4000 heads of families, with 8-10 in a family. Lurje in his *Studien*, p. 42, calculates that the food implied some 20,000 souls, and then arbitrarily reduces the figure to 7000. For Mesopotamian royal budgets see R. P. Dougherty, 'Cuneiform Parallels to Solomon's Provisioning System,' *AASOR* 5 (1925), 23 ff. Cf. the *ménage* of the Persian kings, as noted by Meyer, *GA* 3, I, §54. There is recorded the provision for the daily table of a Tūlūnid potentate of Egypt (ca. A.D. 966): 100 sheep, 100 lambs, fowls of all kinds (P. K. Hitti, *History of the Arabs*, 456). The rest of the section is of secondary character historically, often hyperbolic. For 'many like the sand by the sea' (v.²⁰), cf. Gen. 41⁴⁹, Hos. 2¹, Is. 10²². 'Eating and drinking' has its early parallel in the Old Aramaic Hadad inscription, "in my days Ya'di ate and drank," with a similar but broken passage in the Panammuwa inscr., ". . . ate and drank . . ." Idyllic is the picture of Judah's and Israel's security in v.⁵; see Mic. 4⁴, Zech. 3¹⁰, and cf. II. 18³¹.

The extent of Solomon's empire, variously expressed in vv.¹⁻⁴ is exaggerated, at least in its political implications. The reference to *Over-the-River*, Trans-Euphrates (also Josh. 24², etc.), represents the Ass. imperial phrase, *eber nāri*, appearing actually not earlier than Ashurbanipal's time (*KB* 2, 238-9), and of general use in the Westland later, e.g., Neh. 2⁷; cf. Meyer, *GA* 3, I, 136 ff.; Forrer, *Reallexicon*, I, 134. The phrase here is of late origin, when the Assyrian empire had made current its political language. For statistics of the use of the ambiguous term see Burney, *ad loc.* Solomon was doubtless the most potent monarch in the area; Damascus under its fresh Aramæan rulers had not in his early years achieved political importance, although it later gained autonomy (11^{23ff.}). He possessed some rights in the Lebanon; cf. 9¹⁹, and the accompanying enigmatic statement in Gr. 2^{46c}. His father David had received gifts from King Toi of the Aramaic dynasty at Hamath, and defeated the Aramæan king of Sobah in Cœle (?)-Syria along with his allies of Damascus, the campaign being waged to cut off Sobah's control of the route to the river (2 Sam. 8^{3ff.}). The item of

Tiphseh-Thapsacus² no doubt belongs to the correct tradition of a one-time right which the dynasty had gained in the trade-routes across the desert to the river. Solomon's control of Transjordan northwards from the Red Sea naturally induced a commercial exploitation in that direction. This was the one epoch in Israel's history when such an external commercial control was possible. For Flinders Petrie's recent excavations at Gaza see his reports on 'Ancient Gaza' in *Publications of the British School of Archæology in Egypt*, vols. 53-56 (-1934).

Ch. 5⁹⁻¹⁴ (EVV 4²⁹⁻³⁴). The wisdom of Solomon. In addition to Gr. here, vv. 9^{f.} also appear in Gr. 2^{35a. b.}, and the passage is summarized below, 10^{23f.}=2 Ch. 9^{22f.}. The present theme is an exuberant flowering of the tradition of Solomon's wisdom, of which tradition we can trace the progress. There is the pious prayer of Solomon for 'a discerning heart to judge thy people,' with the expansion of the divine boon to a wisdom beyond human compare (3^{4ff.}); a case given of his judicial wisdom (3^{16ff.}); his political wisdom in his diplomacy with Hiram of Tyre (5²⁶); the visit of the Queen of Sheba 'to prove him with riddles' (10^{1ff.}); the reliable literary tradition of "the proverbs of Solomon which the men of king Hezekiah copied out" (Pr. 25¹). The declamation here knows not only of *three thousand proverbs* but also of *songs, a thousand and five* (v. 12). Indeed Solomon's reputation as an encyclopædic philosopher was early established, late as are the canonical and deuterocanonical books ascribed to him. This literary *genre* of Wisdom had antique roots in the Orient, as also in the Occident (*cf.* Hesiod); there may be noted Margolis's finding of the three early categories of Hebrew literature in Torah, Word or Prophecy, Wisdom (*Hebrew Scriptures in the Making*, ch. 4). The focusing of all Wisdom upon one personage of the past³ is similar to the heroization of Moses for Law and David for Psalms. As father of the realm the ancient king was by duty patron of the arts and sciences;

² The site, at Kala'at ad-Dibs, at the eastern bend of the Euphrates, E of Aleppo, was discovered, as he held, by J. P. Peters; see his *Nippur* (1897), 1, ch. 4; but see Dussaud, *S.A.M. Index*, s.v.

³ For Wisdom, *cf.* Daniel in a Phœn. tradition (Eze. 28³), now confirmed by the person of Danel in the Ugaritic literature; see Virolleaud, *Danel*.

as such a wise king appears Ashurbanipal, who has left a full and exuberant account of his education and attainments.⁴ The most ancient wise man known to history is Ptahhotep, vizier of a Pharaoh in the first half of the third millennium B.C., with a book dedicated to, and composed under the patronage of, the king. For this *wisdom of Egypt* (v.¹⁰) reference may be made to Erman, *Lit. of the Ancient Egyptians*, 54 ff., 234 ff.; the cosmopolitan influence of that Wisdom has been suggested in comparison of Prov. 22¹⁷⁻²⁴ with the proverbs of the Egyptian Amen-em-ope.⁵ For *the wisdom of all the sons of the East* (*Bnê Kēdem*), whose professors are herewith actually named, with Arabic names, see Note, and Montgomery, *Arabia and the Bible*, 169 ff. 'The words of Agur b. Jakeh' (Prov. 30), and 'of Lemuel king of Massa' (31¹⁻⁹), must be attributed to Arabian sources. The wisdom of Solomon, the subjects of which are detailed in v.¹³, *from the cedar in Lebanon to the hyssop that comes out in the wall*, along with the following round of zoology, was particularly a moral, fable wisdom; there are to be compared Jotham's parable of the trees (Jud. 9), that of Jehoash of the thistle and the cedar (II. 14⁹), the parables from nature (Prov. 30^{15ff.}), and the cameo, 'Go to the ant, thou sluggard' (6⁶). The listing of all creatures also recalls the learned Akkadian lists of plants, animals, birds, etc.⁶ It is notable that the Bible contains no development of the animal fable, so luxuriant in the contemporary Oriental literatures, in the Akkadian and in the Old Aramaic, to wit the Ahikar papyri, and later in Arabic literature, e.g., *The Thousand and One Nights*. The figure of *a thousand and five songs* (v.¹²) appears quite casual;

⁴ See Luckenbill, *ARA* 2, §§767, 934, 986; cf. Olmstead, *HA* ch. 38.

⁵ Only brief reference may be made to the extensive recent bibliography for the subject at large: W. Baumgartner, *Israel u. altor. Weisheit* (1933); J. Fichtner, *Die altor. Weisheit in ihrer israel-jüdischen Ausprägung*, *BZAW* 62 (1933); Hempel, *Altheb. Lit.*, 44 ff.; Robinson and Oesterley, *Int.*, 150 ff., 437 ff.; Eissfeldt, *Eint.*, §10; B. Gemser, *Sprüche Salomos*, 1937. *N.b.* Eissf.'s conclusion (p. 527) that the tradition of Solomon's patronage of letters is 'eine richtig festgehaltene Tatsache.'

⁶ See Weber, *Lit. d. Babylonier u. Assyrer*, 293 ff.; Meissner, *Bab. u. Ass.*, ch. 22; Ebeling, *Die babylonische Fabel . . .*, *Mitteilungen der Altor. Gesellschaft*, 2, Heft 3, 1927.

but light may be thrown upon it from Egypt. Erman observes (p. 293) concerning a papyrus published by Gardiner that the composition "might have once borne the title of *The Thousand Songs*, for . . . its individual sections bear each a number. Of these numbers only two are wanting to complete the thousand, and they will have stood in the break at the end of the page." The additional 'five' in the Biblical figure then may have been added for good measure, as in the Arabic *The Thousand and One Nights*. We may compare the 1000 women of Solomon's harem (11³). The advent of *all the kings of the earth*, who came to hear the wisdom of Solomon (v.¹⁴), naturally implied the royal sport of riddles, conundrums, as presented below in the Queen of Sheba's visit (ch. 10). Such a tourney of wits is described by Josephus (*Ant.*, viii, 5, 3; *C. Ap.*, i, 17, citing from Dios): there was a heavy wager on between Solomon and Hiram of Tyre for the solution of riddles, and Solomon won; to which Tyrian tradition added the story that a certain Tyrian proposed further riddles which Solomon could not answer, and the latter had to refund the money he had won. A similar theme is used in the late Ahikar legend, in which Ahikar wins himself back to royal favour by saving his master's realm and honour in a riddle contest with the king of Egypt. (For this late legend see reff. in Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri*, p. 204.) For the early development of the later exuberant theme of Solomon's magical wisdom see Jos., *Ant.*, viii, 2, 5. See further Comm. on the Queen of Sheba's visit, ch. 10. For the later expansion of this *genre* in connexion with Solomon's name Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews*, vol. 4, should be consulted.

Ch. 4. 20. הים : 9 MSS deR. pref. שמת = ש A, but a borrowing from the similar phrase elsewhere, e.g., v.⁹.—Ch. 5. 1. ארץ פלישתים : 2 Ch. 9²⁶ pref. ויער, and so G 2^{46k}; but our text is authoritative, found in Hex. (A x S^{II}), T S V, with the unconstruable phrase translated 'the river of the land of P.'; it is doubtless an early gloss. to the foll. phrase.—כנישים : such verbal use of the ppl. is generally late, Aramaizing, but this case is in rhetorical parallelism with 4²⁰.—2. כר : the *kôr* has been estimated at 364 litres; see Nowack, *Arch.*, 1, §35, Benz., *Arch.*, §40, Šanda, pp. 93, 106.—סלת : 'grits,' translated here with *σεμιδαλις* and identical with modern Arabic *smīd*; see Dalman, *BWAT* 13 (1913), 69, for the proportions as given here, and *A. u. S.*, 3, 284, 288 ff.—3. בקר רע :

'pastured cattle'; P construes as appositional; see GK §139, c. —יהבו: Grr. ignore.—בנידוש אבנים: 'cribbed x'; VSS, exc. Grr., 'fatted birds,' recalling the hand-stuffed poultry of the modern Orient; S for ב *ορνιθων εκλεκτων*, construing 'x=σιτεντα, with the prec. accusatives; Jos. finds 'fishes' in this noun.—4. הנהו . . . בתפסה: S om. here (S^H ✕), prob. to avoid contradiction of 2^{46f.}, where 'h' is represented with *Ραφει*. For 'h' W. A. Heidel ingeniously proposes etymology from *בנה*, 'to cross over' (*The Day of Yahweh*, 1929, 185).—עניו: very many MSS, edd., עניו (see deR.)=GV.—6. איהו: cf. 2 Ch. 9²⁵, 32²⁸. The tr. 'stalls' comes down by Jewish tradition (Jastrow, *Dict.*, 34a). The noun with this mng. appears in Syr., and also in Akk. (Bezold, *BAG* 3); the same column in Bezold notes a verb *arū*, 'to become pregnant,' which may well be the basis of Gr. *τοκάδες, θήλειαι*.—7. קרו: one who has *entrée*, regular guest; Grr., *διαγγελματα*, which S^H repeats; P 'necessaria.'—8. רכש: this species of horse has not been identified; it is used of the chariot horse, Mic. 1¹³, of the post horse, Est. 8¹⁰; Grr., *αρματα*, as for רכש?—9. אלהיו: Grr., S^H T as יהוה; similar use of 'God' at 3¹¹⁻²⁸, 10²⁴; this as with the thought of 'the Divine Wisdom.'—רהב: Grr., exc. Sym., *χυμα*, 'overflow'= S^H .—10. בני קרו: Grr., *αρχαιων ανθρωπων*, similarly 2^{35b}, also Jos.,= S^H .—11a. האדום: Šanda ingeniously suggests *האדומים*, 'the Edomites.'—The foll. names have Arabian connexions. איהן is elative from Arab. *watana*, and so prob. היתן=Sabæan איתן (*NPS* 2, 27); for איהיה cf. Minæan *ḡh* (*ib.*, p. 47). Cf. the genealogy in 1 Ch. 2⁸.—11b. S S^L om., and so Kit., St., Šanda, as superfluous with v.¹⁴.—12. שירו: Kit., Šanda would read as pl.; but the m. sing. is primarily collective in contrast to the fem.—הששה ואלף: Grr., *πεντακισχιλιοι* (= S^H), scribal error for *πεντε και χιλιοι*=Jos.—13. אהוש: 'hyssop'; for identification see Post, *DB s.v.*, Kit., Šanda, and Dalman, *A. u. S.*, 1, 2, 370 f., 543 ff.—14b. St. reasonably elides as induced by 10^{24f.}. S^L S^H S^H S^H preface 'he took gifts,' after 2 Ch. 9^{23f.}.—טאה: Burn. proposes as 'deputed by (all the kings),' *cf.* 2 Sam. 15³.

VV.¹⁵⁻³² (=JV; EVV ch. 5). || 2 Ch. 2; cf. *Ant.*, viii, 2, 6-9. Introduction to the history of the building of the Temple.

VV.¹⁵⁻²⁶. The negotiations with Hiram of Tyre. This section presents an early picture of correct historical similitude, reporting diplomatic and commercial relations between two states of Syro-Palestine—actually in its extent a fairly unique report. The initial 'conversations' between the two monarchs are stated in diplomatic form: 15. *And Hiram King of Tyre sent his ministers to Solomon, for he heard that they had anointed him king in his father's place; for Hiram had always been a friend of David.* 16. *And Solomon sent* (a message)

to Hiram, as follows:— There ensues (vv.¹⁷⁻¹⁹) an expanded statement of Solomon's object in pursuing the kindly relations with Hiram, the procuring of cedar timbers for the buildings he had in mind. There is patent dependence upon the story of Nathan's oracle in 2 Sam. 7, in its present, secondary form (as first recognized by Budde), replacing the original notion of 'a house' as a dynasty, with that of 'a house for YHWH.'¹ On the other hand v.²⁰ correctly, even if in imagined language, gives the gist of Solomon's reply (*n.b.* the item of 'the Sidonians,' after early usage), even as vv.²¹⁻²³ aptly compose Hiram's answer. The invented material here is simple in comparison with that of the Chronicler, who makes Solomon the initiator of the diplomatic correspondence, along with bloated epistles, and the tradition accepted by Josephus, who presents these letters in altered form and alleges that "they are still in the public records of Tyre." For such brotherly congratulations on a royal accession there is an example in David's embassy to Hanun king of Ammon (2 Sam. 10), and for a much earlier period the congratulatory letter of the king of Alashia (Cyprus) to the king of Egypt on the latter's accession, contained in the Amarna letters; they were accompanied with gifts for the sacred festival.² Hiram (the name shortened from 'Ahiram,' as the inscription of an earlier Ahiram of Byblos, *ca.* 1200 B.C., now shows³) can be dated only approximately from Josephus's citation of the Phœnician annals: Meyer, *ca.* 969-936; Kittel, 972-932; Mahler (p. 175), 979-945; Olmstead, *HPS* 981-947; Albright with more reserve, *ARI* 69, 'about the middle of the tenth century.' He is correctly designated *king of Tyre*, as over against the later revival of the ancient title, 'king of Sidonia,' upon the extension of the Tyrian power over all Phœnicia; the latter title is properly used of Ahab's father-in-law (16³¹).⁴ Hiram is

¹ For various forms of criticism of the whole section see Stade, *ZAW* 3 (1883), 129 ff.; Šanda, 'Salomo u. seine Zeit,' *Biblische Zeitfragen*, 1913, 1 ff.; Hölcher in the Gunkel-*Eucharisterion*, 1, 158 ff.

² Knudtzon, nos. 33, 34.

³ See Bibliography of Inscriptions.

⁴ See Meyer, *GA* 2, 2, sect. 11, 'Die Phöniker,' esp. pp. 62, 126 f., and for the succession, pp. 437 ff.; Kittel, *GVI* 2, 210 ff. For a more specific statement of synchronism between Hiram and Solomon, see below, Comm. 61-37.

called a *friend* [Heb. primary mng., *lover*, and so EVV] of *David*, with Solomon's reminiscence of his aid in building David's palace (2 Sam. 5¹¹); the diplomatic title would have been 'my brother,' as in the Amarna letters and *inf.*, 9¹³, 20^{32f.}. Hiram's blessing of YHWH (v.²¹) has its parallel in an Amarna letter with its blessings of Shamash and Ishtar upon the Pharaoh's head.⁵ Criticism has been keen upon the alleged intrusion of the epithet for Solomon as a *wise son* (v.²¹), and especially against v.^{26a} as an interpolation based upon v.²¹, with reference to 'the wisdom given Solomon by YHWH'; so Klostermann, and other critics, and according to Stade this whole story is a continuation of that of the dream in ch. 3. But the wisdom declared here is of political character; v.^{26a} is to be translated: *And YHWH giving wisdom to Solomon, as he had spoken to him, there ensued amity* [Heb., the general word *peace*] *between Hiram and Solomon, and the two made a league together*. This passage may well have been original to the story developed above, and so Kittel assigns it to his Solomon-source. Apart from 'the covenant' between Asa and the Syrian Ben-hadad (2 Ch. 16^{2ff.}), severely castigated by the seer Hanani, this is the only reference to a league with another state; the term could hardly have been used by late writers, Deuteronomists, etc., in view of the prohibition in Jud. 2².⁶ The wisdom with which Solomon was endowed, 'to judge this thy great people' (see above on 3^{4ff.}, 5^{9ff.}), included diplomacy and the erection of splendid buildings. Such political use of 'wisdom' is illustrated in Ashur's boast, "By my wisdom have I done this" (Is. 10¹³), and for Solomon's wisdom as a builder may be compared Tiglath-Pileser's self-congratulation: "With the keen understanding and grasp of intellect with which the Master of the Gods, the prince, Nudinwat (Ea) endowed me, a palace of cedar . . . and a portico patterned after a Hittite palace for my enjoyment I built in Calah" (ARA I, §804). The Assyrian king's construction of a

⁵ Knudtzon, no. 21. Most of the early VSS dodged the use of 'YHWH' in the alien's mouth; but for the naming of the national deity of another people, cf. Jephthah's reference to 'Chemosh thy god' (Jud. 11²⁴), the Ass. Tartan's knowledge of YHWH (II. 18^{25ff.}), and the Moabite Mesha's naming of him in his inscription.

⁶ EVV tr. *bēvīt*, otherwise always rendered with 'covenant,' in these secular relations with 'league'—a survival of the ancient objection!

palace after Hittite, *i.e.*, Syrian style, is a parallel to Solomon's use of Phœnician art and artists. We may compare the remarkable letter of Hammurabi informing Zimrilim king of Mari, on the Euphrates, of the desire of the king of Ugarit (Ras Shamra) to see the palace in Mari (G. Dossin, *CR* 1937, 19; *cf.* A Parrot, *Syria*, 1937, 75, n.). And, coming nearer home, Josephus has preserved to us, on the authority of Dios (*Ant.*, viii, 5, 3), the record that the same Hiram "went up to Mount Lebanon and cut down woods for the building of the temples"—the temple of Jupiter having been named immediately before.⁷ Šanda gives a summary of Ass.-Bab. and Greek references, and Olmstead presents ample Akk. references, along with a relief of the floating of cedar logs down the Euphrates.⁸ Further reference to the use of cedar in temple and palace will be given below in Comm. on cc. 6, 7. In comparison with v.²³, detailing the transportation of the logs to the sea and their rafting to the Palestinian coast, an inscription of Nebuchadnezzar's, found in the Lebanese Wadi Brisa, is pertinent.⁹ In a broken text, after naming the temples of Nabu and Marduk, he speaks of "the Lebanon, the cedar mountain . . . the scent is pleasant of the cedars;" and then: "What no former king had accomplished, I cleaved high mountains, lime-stone I broke off, I opened. I cut a road for the cedars, and before Marduk my king (I brought) massive, tall, strong cedars, of wonderful beauty, whose dark appearance was impressive, the mighty product of the Lebanon." (Of course the work was done by the skilled Syrian engineers and labourers.) A following broken passage records their transportation 'like reeds' on 'the canal Arahtu.' To this material are to be added far earlier references from the Egyptian quarter, and notably the autobiographical Voyage of Wen-amon, detailing all his trials as purchasing agent in Phœnicia on the Pharaoh's demand for the valuable wood

⁷ For cedar, cypress, fir, see BDD *s.vv.*, Dalman, *A. u. S.*, I, I, 259. For the most recent study in determination of the genus of the Lebanon cedar used by the ancient builders, see L. Köhler, *ZAW* 1937, 163 ff.; he holds that the Heb. word is inclusive of several genera, but does not mean the *Cedrus Libani*, which is unfit for building.

⁸ *HA* 272 ff., with accompanying fig. 108, *cf.* Index, *s.v.* 'Cedar'; see also Meissner, *Bab. u. Ass.*, I, Index, *s.v.* 'Zeder.'

⁹ See Winckler, *KTAT* 56 ff.; Rogers, *CP* 365 f.

(ca. 1100 B.C.),¹⁰ of which this brief extract may be given: "The prince rejoiced and appointed 300 men and 300 oxen, and set overseers at their head, in order that they might fell the trees. And they felled them, and they remained lying over the winter. But in the third month of summer they were dragged to the shore." In our passage the method of water-transportation is given as *by rafts* (the word=etymologically *tow-rafts*), the only possible method for such huge timbers. The Chronicler (2 Ch. 2¹⁵) makes Joppa the port of entry, by doubtless good tradition.

The payment made annually by Solomon to Hiram of 20,000 *kors* of wheat as food for his household and 20 *kors* of bruised-olive oil (v.²⁵), with a *kor* estimated at 364 litres (see Note, v.²), is indeed an extravagant figure for the item of the wheat. Solomon's provision of wheat foods for the year amounted to 32,850 *kors* (v.²). The easy exaggeration of figures in tradition appears in 2 Ch. 2⁹ with '20,000 baths of oil,' which the Gr. read in here, while Ch. further exaggerates items and figures most absurdly. This provision was not for the workers, only the luxuries of wheat and oil are listed here; by *the house* of Hiram is meant his privy budget, and if the high figure is to be maintained at all, he must have made good business by exporting the grain foods, as Šanda remarks. Whatever the value of the figures may be, a datum at 9¹¹ frankly reports that Solomon went bankrupt for a 20-years' debt and had to cede to Hiram twenty Galilæan cities.

Only the outlines of this section can be regarded as authentic history. But there is the undoubted fact that Solomon entered into a league with Hiram for trade purposes, the details of which league and its operation are fully illustrated by contemporary documents. The further interest of Hiram in this international compact appears in his aiding Solomon's ventures in the waters of the Indian Ocean (9^{26ff.}, 10^{11. 22}), on which his shippers were to ply to his profit.

¹⁰ See Breasted, *ARE* vol. 4, no. 578; Erman, *Lit. of the Anc. Egyptians*, 174 ff.; Gressmann, *ATB* 1, 71 ff.; Barton, *AB* ch. 18. Of earlier date is Thutmose III's record of his procurement of cedar logs 'of 60 ells of length with a thick top,' which were brought to Egypt 'with a good wind'; see K. Sethe, *Sb.*, Berlin Academy, 15 (1906), 356 ff.; Gressmann, p. 90. For the ancient relations of Egypt and Phœnicia see P. Montet, *Byblos et l'Égypte* (1928-29).

VV.²⁷⁻³² (AV RVV vv.¹³⁻¹⁸). The work in the Lebanon and the Phœnician co-operation. It is generally recognized that of this section only vv.^{29, 30} are secondary. Stade cautiously decides (p. 148) that the section vv.^{27, 28} is "eine alte glaubwürdige, mit späteren Vorstellungen wie 9^{21, 22} stark contrastierende Nachricht. . . . Vielleicht ist 5³¹ erst nach 7^{9, 10} gearbeitet. . . . Allerdings könnten in v.³² Trümmer des ursprünglichen Berichtes gesucht werden." The inserted vv. have exaggerated figures as compared with vv.^{27, 28}, figures similar to the Chronicler's, while v.^{30b} is patent expansion of a simpler statement at 9²³. According to v.²⁷ *the levy was raised out of all Israel*, with no contamination from the later invention of the enslavement of the Canaanites for this duty, as according to 9²⁰⁻²² and the parallel in Ch. The figures for the drafted labourers, 30,000, and for the allotment of duty, 10,000 for every third month, are reasonable. This *corvée* of Israelites provided the raw labour in the Lebanon, in contrast with the skilled labour of the Sidonians (v.²⁰). The *superintendents* (lit., *chiefs of the overseers*) number 3300; the figure has been expanded from the '550' of 9²³, the development of 550 to 3300 being in the ratio of the 30,000 of v.²⁸ to the 180,000 (the 150,000 of the interpolated v.²⁹ plus the original 30,000)—a nice piece of editorial arithmetic. (See the writer's Note, *JAOS* 1938, 135.) For textual variations from '3300' and for other calculations see Note. The figure 550 would give one superintendent to every gang of about 54 labourers. The archival character of the items need not be doubted. Witness the tremendous figures given for food-supplies in the two royal South Arabic inscriptions contemporary to the reconstruction of the Marib Dam in the Yemen, A.D. 450, 543, in each of which inscriptions, *inter al.*, 200,000 or 207,000 sheep are reported to have been butchered for the labourers in a year's job in each case.¹¹ The reference to the stone-cutting in vv.^{31f.} is parallel with 7^{9ff.}, and properly introduces the Phœnician master carpenters and masons whom Solomon employed in Jerusalem. These are specifically

¹¹ See E. Glaser, 'Zwei Inschriften über den Dambruch von Marib,' *MVG* 1897, and *CIS* IV, nos. 540, 541. For the Biblical and parallel Oriental references to the *corvée* see I. Mendelsohn, 'State Slavery in Ancient Palestine.'

named as *the Gublites*, citizens of ancient and famous Gubl-Gupn-Byblos on the Syrian coast. For its distinguished place in ancient history see Montet, *op. cit.*, and for the present record Dussaud, 'Byblos et la mention des Gublites dans l'A.T.,' *Syria*, 1923, 300 ff. For various ancient misunderstandings of the word and modern attempts at re-writing see Note. There is no reason to doubt this novel datum; later editors of the tradition and the text would not have introduced the Gentile Gublites as co-operators in the building of the Temple; in 7^{13r}. pains are taken to note that the Tyrian artist Hiram had an Israelite mother. The Gublites were employed by Solomon in the same way as Solomon used Phœnician naval experts to build and man his ships in the Red Sea (9^{26ff.}), as Sennacherib used Phœnician carpenters to build 'Hittite' ships for him in the Persian Gulf (*ARA* 2, pp. 145, 148, 154).

15. Ⓞ prefixed with report of the Egyptian marriage from 3¹, adding 9¹⁶, *in re* the dowry—an artificial arrangement to group together these international alliances, *vs.* Kit., Comm., and *BH*, who regards the Gr. order original.—הָרִיב: =Grr., *Χειραυ*, but הָרִיב, vv.^{24. 32} (after later Phœn. pronunciation; see Harris, *Gram.*, §11), and so Jos., *Ειρησμος*; the same change of spelling for the Tyrian artist's name, 7^{13. 40}. Such variations stand for legitimate double pronunciations, the older *Ḳre* being given first as a rule, and so here. The full form of the name, אהרִיב (see Comm.) occurs at Num. 26³⁸; *cf.* אהרִיב <הִיאֵל, 16³⁴. Ch. has throughout, Kt. or *Ḳr.*, the unexplained הָרִיב.—לִפְנֵיךָ. . . אֵל שׁ' Ⓞ Ⓞ^L *χρῖσαι τ.Σ.* (!).—*מִשְׁחָו*: indef. pl.—17. אַתָּה יִרְעָה וְנִי' אהה ירעה ו' *cf.* GK §117, e. אלהיו.—Grr., 'my God,' by subtle change.—הַמְלָכֹת: the Grr. improve upon the difficult grammar. St. would read either a pl. subject, or a sing. verb; Kit. interprets, "the hostility with which they surrounded me" (for double acc. *cf.* Ps. 109³), and so Šanda; or the noun may be taken in collective sense, *cf.* הָרִיב מִרְיֹן, Jud. 5⁷ (so Burn.), and for such cases with fem. sing. subj. see GK §145, e.; or ו' may be an old prepositional form, הָרִיב וְנִי'—הָרִיב וְנִי' 2⁰ יהוה.—הָרִיב וְנִי': many MSS agree with which all VSS agree (also JV). The *Ḳr.* arose from the sophisticated notion that then David himself should have built the temple. St. regards the half-verse as a stupid gloss. But עַד, like Arab. *ḡata*, has final sense="until at last Y. put them under his feet," and *sc.*, "now I, S., will build." For the figurative expression *cf.* Ps. 110¹, and Gunkel, *ad loc.*, comparing the declaration of a Canaanite vassel in an Amarna letter that he is the Pharaoh's 'footstool.'—18. *no enemy*, etc.: this was true of the beginning of the reign, despite Benz.'s criticism.—19. אִמְרֵי: in sense

of 'to think, intend,' *e.g.*, Ex. 2¹⁴.—20. וַתֵּן : usual introduction to the substance of a letter ; see Note, II. 5⁶.—אָרוֹם : Grr. as though עַיִם, preferred by Benz., St., Šanda, because of the two species named v.²² ; but with Burn. this is a sophisticated correction ; the cedars were the prime object.—שָׁר עֲבָרִיךָ : B a₂† have reduced to δουλειας σου.—B† ὡς for εἰδος.—21. יהוה : so all Heb. MSS, Grr. tr. with 'God,' and so all the other VSS, except Ⓞ^L 'the Lord God of Israel' ; there is no reason, with Klost. Burn., to be concerned over the original.—23. עֲבָרִיךָ : BH sugg. עֲבָרִיךָ, but cf. vv.^{27, 28}.—יהוה : Grr. as though יהוה, which St., BH accept on ground of haplog. ; but the emendation, natural in a translation, is not necessary.—רָבִירָה : the root='to lead' ; Ch. has an unexplained word, רַבְרִירָה, the present word may have required further explication.—The following 'pregnant construction' (St.) does not require an additional verb (the ppl. has verbal force), such as Ch. supplies with וַתֵּבִיא, or as BH sugg. וַתֵּבִיא, OGr. om.—24. וַתֵּבִיא בְּרוּשִׁים : Ⓞ om.—כָּל : IO MSS deR., לָכֵן ; Luc. MSS κατὰ παν, correcting error in Ⓞ MSS, και παν=Ⓞ^H.—25. וַתֵּבִיא בְּרוּשִׁים : parallel with וַתֵּבִיא בְּרוּשִׁים, v.²⁴ ; for the antithesis of nominal clauses see Dr., *Tenses*, §160.—כָּל : OGr. (και) μαχεיר, Hex. MSS μαχαλ, etc. ; Aq., in MS j, ματροφην, cited as a gloss by MS 71=Ⓞ^H ; for כָּל < כָּל (Is. 9⁴) see Haupt as 'phonetic spelling,' *cf.* Akk. parallels ; Bergstr., *HG* 91, *inf.*, regards it as 'wohl Schreibfehler.'—28. בְּבֵיתוֹ : =Ⓞ Ⓞ ; Grr., Ⓞ^H 'in their house,' by translators' improvement ; prob. to be read with St., BH, בְּבֵית, 'at home.'—29. וַתֵּבִיא בְּרוּשִׁים : =VSS ; Ch., בְּ alone, and possibly here conflation between the parallels ; Burn. sugg. apposition ; it is best, with St., to read בְּרוּשִׁים, as at 11²⁸.—For the '150,000' note the expansion in Ch.—30. The v. drawn from 9²³=Gr. 2^{35b}.—לִישְׁלֹמֹה : St. elides, arguing that preceding אֲשֶׁר is expected, but this is not necessary (Šanda) ; the parallel text has a better order.—'3300' : =Jos. ; the following variations may be noted : B *al.* 3600 (a round number, not to be preferred, with Burn.)=Ch. ; Ⓞ^L '3700,' Hex., '3500.' Šanda makes a clever attempt at exact calculation of the ratio 3300/3600 chiefs to 180,000 labourers, on the basis of some Egyptian figures ; but, as noted above, the writer was working on the given figure, 550.—31. 32. These vv. have been transposed in Ⓞ after 6¹, to make these building operations come after the start of the temple.—31. יְקִירֹת : the identification with Akk. *aḫru*, used of precious stones, fails in this connexion ; Conti Rossini ingeniously and correctly connects the word with Eth. *wahara*, used particularly of stone-cutting, and with S. Arab. *tḫr*, which appears in parallelism with 'wood' in building texts (*Chrest.*, 257). Dillmann in his *Lex.* had earlier compared the Eth. root with Arab. *ḫāva*. אֲבָנֵי נֹיִם at end of the v. may be exegetical to that word or a gloss.—32. בְּנֵי : Grr., 'sons of,' as for בְּנֵי=Ⓞ^H with 'servants' in marg. ; Ⓞ אֲרֵכְלִי=Akk. *ardē ēkalli*, possibly 'builders' (Bezold, *BAG* 66), a notable survival.—הַיְבֻלִים : Ⓞ

εβαλαν αυτους, ע^{L} ερεβαλον αυτ. ; Jos., οι Βιβλιοι = ס^{H} , as from Aq. : פ 'Giblii/Biblii' ; $\text{ט} \text{ס}$ אִי־בִּיבְלִיָּא, also used at II. 12¹² for בָּנִים ; see St. and Haupt for attempts to explain this word of evidently Akk. origin. Unnecessary corrections have been advanced : יגבלי , "bordered them with grooved edges" (!), so Then., BDB, Burn., cf. BH ; יפיל , so Klost., with most dubious interpretation.

Ch. 6. The building of the Temple. || 2 Ch. 3¹⁻¹⁴ ; cf. *Ant.*, viii, 3, 1-3. Cf. the Mishnaic tractate, *Middoth*, which was translated and fully commented upon by L. Cappel in his *Trisagion*, with extensive citations from Maimonides's monograph on the Temple, *Beth habbehirah*, reprinted by Walton in his *Biblicus Apparatus*, 120-207 ; see also F. J. Hollis, *The Archæology of Herod's Temple, With a Commentary on the Tractate 'Middoth,'* 1934, and for a translation, H. Danby, *The Mishnah* (1933), 589 ff. For particular criticism of the text see Stade, 'Der Text des Berichtes über Salomos Bauten,' *ZAW* 3, 129 ff. = his *Akad. Reden*, 143 ff., and his *Geschichte*, 1, 325 ff. Of the extensive literature may be cited : Ewald, *HI* 3, 226 ff. ; Perrot and Chipiez, *Histoire de l'art dans l'antiquité* ; the articles on 'Temple' in *DB* (T. W. Davies), *EB* (Benzinger), *JE* (Barton), on 'Tempel' by Galling in *RGG* and *BR* ; G. A. Smith, *Jerusalem*, 2, ch. 3 ; S. A. Cook ; *The Religion of Ancient Palestine, passim* ; E. Klamroth, *Lade u. Tempel*, 1932 ; K. Möhlenbrink, *Der Tempel Salomos*, 1932 ; K. Galling, 'Das allerheiligste in Salomos Tempel,' *JPOS* 1932, 43 ff. ; C. Watzinger, *DP* 1, 88 ff. ; the illuminating brief essay by G. E. Wright, 'Solomon's Temple Resurrected,' *BA* 4, 2 (1941), 17 ff. The volumes by W. C. Shaw, *Solomon's Temple* (1907), *The Second Temple in Jerusalem* (1908), are most uncritical. Plans and elevations of the building, especially those of Stade and Benzinger, have been reproduced in many of the works cited above, and, e.g., in Skinner's *Comm.*, Kent, *SOT*, Barton, *AB*. Most recent is Albright's presentation in *ARI* ch. 5, sect. 2, with detail of the archaeological light thrown upon the temple and its furnishings. To this list is to be added L. Waterman's monograph, "The Damaged 'Blueprints' of the Temple of Solomon," in *JNES* 1943, 284 ff. This, with revision of text, e.g., 6¹⁰, presents a fresh and reasonable basis for understanding of the temple plans.

For comparison with ancient styles of architecture the

following literature may be noted. Nowack (*Arch.*, 2, 34 f.) argues against Benzinger's theory of Egyptian type for the Syrian influences on this structure, and refers to Puchstein, 'Die Säule in d. ass. Architektur' (*Jahrb. of the German Arch. Inst.*, 7, Heft 1), whom he cites as follows (from p. 13): "Nach den noch gegenwärtig wenig sicheren Beispielen syrischen Tempelbaues gehörten zu einem vollständigen alt-syrischen Tempelbaue Vorhalle, Celle, Allerheiligste und Seitenbau." W. Andrae in his *Das Gotteshaus u. die Urformen des Bauens im Alten Orient* (1930) finds (p. 25) Solomon's temple, as 'Langenhaustempel' with portico, hall, sanctuary, to be in correspondence with Assyrian architecture. In criticism of this view see Gallig, *BR* 516 ff. There may be noted here H. Thiersch, 'Ein altmediterraner Tempeltypus,' *ZAW* 1932, 73 ff., presenting comparison of the ancient temple-plans at Tell el-Hesy, Gerar, and Shechem with types distributed over the Mediterranean. For temple-construction in Babylonia and Assyria see Meissner, *Bab. u. Ass.*, 1, 302 ff., and Mowinckel's analysis of the Near-Oriental building inscriptions, in the *Gunkel-Eucharisterion*, 1, 278 ff., esp. 293 ff. M. von Oppenheim's *Der Tell Halaf* presents the remains of the temple, royal buildings, art objects of that Syrian site of the second millennium B.C., all illustrative of Solomon's creation. For a later period may be compared, for the effect upon the observer, Lucian's description of the temple of the Syrian goddess (cc. 30 ff.). For South Arabian architecture may be noted the inscriptions with full building specifications, as well as figures for the workers and their food supplies (examples in Conti Rossini, *Chrest.*, nos. 67 ff.); for the subject at large see D. Nielsen, *HAA* 1, 135 ff.

For the proposition of the exact orientation of the Temple, so that at the equinox the rising sun illuminated the *dëbîr*, the remote shrine, a theory that has produced a mass of literature, see Morgenstern, 'The Gates of Righteousness,' *HUCA* 6 (1929), 1 ff., and 'The Calendars of Anc. Israel,' *ib.*, 10 (1935), 1 ff., 76 ff., etc.; F. J. Hollis, 'The Sun-Cult and the Temple at Jerusalem,' in Hooke, *Myth and Ritual* (esp. pp. 89 ff.); Graham and May, *Culture and Conscience* (Index, s.v. 'Sun'), and May, 'Some Aspects of Solar Worship at Jerusalem,' *ZAW* 1937, 269 ff. However, such orientation,

whatever its origin, does not involve sun-worship; compare the ancient and abiding ritual habit of the Church's worship towards the east. According to Lucian his goddess's temple 'looks to the rising sun' (§29), and this aspect of a sanctuary appears in Nabataean shrines (Glueck, *BASOR* 69 [1938], 17). The ancient temples at Tell en-Nasbeh, Gerar, Shechem 'faced' (*i.e.*, with their doors) the approximate east (Thiersch, *op. cit.*, plate opp. p. 80). The Phœnician inscription of Mas'ub (3d cent. B.C.—Lidzb., *HNE* 419; Cooke, *NSI* no. 10) records a porch 'on the east and to the north (?)' for a temple. C. Rathjens and H. v. Wissmann in vol. 2 of their *Südarabien-Reise* (1932—pp. 61 ff.) describe the temple at Ḥugga as orientated like Solomon's. On the subject at large see G. Martigny, 'Die geographische u. astronomische Orientation altmesopotamischer Tempel,' *OLz.*, 1938, Aug.—Sept., and for the Hellenic world the thorough discussion by W. B. Dinsmoor, 'Archæology and Astronomy,' *Proc. Am. Philosoph. Soc.*, 80 (1939), 95—173. The established current opinion is that the Temple faced eastwards towards the Rock (Arabic, *eṣ-ṣahrah*), of hoary religious significance, which was the site of Solomon's brazen altar. For the Rock and its significance see Kittel, *Studien z. hebr. Archäologie*, 1—96. Hans Schmidt in *Der Heilige Fels* (1933) defends the traditional view of the location of the *dēbîr*, like the Mosque of Omar, over the Rock; see reviews in *JPOS* 1934, 304 ff., *JQR* 24, 194 ff.

The present document is particularly original. Note Watzinger's judgment (*op. cit.*, 88): the record "muss doch auf eine urkundliche Quelle aus der Zeit, vielleicht einen Baubericht des Königs selbst, zurückgehen." Compare the stone figure of Sumerian Gudea planning his temple according to his god's specifications (see Clay, *Light on the O.T. from Babel*, plate opp. p. 160; Gressman, *ATB* 2, Abb. 44). But unlike Gudea's sense of divine inspiration, and in the Bible the divine plans for the Tabernacle and Ezekiel's second Temple, this record is coolly objective: Solomon built the temple. We actually possess in these chapters concerning the construction and furnishing of a temple the fullest and most detailed specifications from the ancient Oriental world.

For literary analysis of the text see in particular *SBOT*. There is to be noted Šanda's radical rearrangement: vv.^{1. 2.}

19. 17. 20a. 3. 4. 9. 15. 16. 18. 29. 21. 20b. 22. 30. 23a. 26. 23b. 24. 25. 27. 28. 31-35. 5. 6. 8. 10. 36. 11-14. 7. 37. 38. Moffatt in his translation of the Bible has also made a rearrangement. But such reordering of materials has no authority, is only of possible advantage to the eye in study of details; ancient specifications need not have been as orderly as modern. Many of the passages that appear out of place are glosses, as the text below will attempt to exhibit.

1. *And it came to pass in the 480th year of the exodus of the Bnê-Israel from the land of Egypt,*

in the fourth year, in the month Ziv (that is, the second month), of Solomon's reign over Israel, that he built the house to YHWH.

37. *In the fourth year was founded the house of YHWH, in the moon Ziv. 38. And in the eleventh year, in the moon Bul (that is, the eighth month), the house was finished according to all its details and all its art; and he built it in seven years.*

VV.^{37. 38}, with the inclusive dates of the construction, give the original archival datum and in the proper place; for convenience of parallelism they are presented here. The duplication of the first item here was due to a logical disposition in connexion with the era-date 480. Cf. the arbitrary rearrangement in \mathfrak{G} \mathfrak{G}^L , by which 5^{21. 32a}, 6^{37. 38} are introduced after v.¹, as belonging technically here. Ch. knows the day of inception, 'the second day of the second month.'

1a. The Grr. faulted 'the 480th year' and corrected it to 'the 440th year'; this is probably due to the fact that the genealogy of Aaron to Sadok inclusive (I Ch. 5^{29ff.}) counts but eleven persons, *i.e.*, $11 \times 40 = 440$; \mathfrak{S}^H also follows this reckoning, and Aquila's and Symmachus's agreement with \mathfrak{I} is known only from Codex M. For acceptance of the round number 480 as historical see Keil, with reff.; Šanda; H. Hänslér, *Biblica*, 12 (1931), 395 ff.; Marston, *New Bible Evidence*, ch. 10; W. J. Chapman, *ZAW* 1935, 185 ff. (proposing Egyptian sources for the chronology). Marston, accepting the Biblical figure, dates the Exodus at 1447-1437, the founding of the temple at 967-957 (*The Bible Comes Alive*,

App. IV). But along with the present lowering of the date for the Exodus on the basis of archæology, it is now generally recognized that we have here an artificial date of secondary origin, balanced by the attempt of likeminded chronologers to find 480 years between this date and the Exile. Note the conservative Rawlinson's scepticism on the datum here in note to end of the chapter. See Int., §16. For a recent careful study see H. H. Rowley, 'Israel's Sojourn in Egypt,' *Bull. John Rylands Library*, 22 (1938), 1 ff. The whole of v.¹ is accordingly editorial. On the authority of Menander Josephus (*Contra Apionem*, i, 18) sets the date of the building in the 12th year of Hiram. Such dating as from the Tyrian annals has evidently been accepted from Jewish sources; see R. Pietschmann, *Gesch. d. Phönizier*, 132 ff., Meyer, *GA* 2, 2, 79 ff. However, the scribal calculation, if it be such, is approximately correct and so to be honoured; according to Meyer's chronology (p. 438) Hiram's 12th year was *ca.* 957, Solomon's 4th year 956/951. The rare archaic names for the months are evidence of the originality of the document, as also the older word for the lunar period, 'moon.' They are converted into terms of the numbered months of the later calendar, starting in the spring. See also Comm., 12^{32ff.}.

VV.²⁻¹⁰. The construction of the Temple.

2. *And the house which King Solomon built for YHWH: 60 cubits its length, and 20 'cubits' [plus with MSS, VSS] its width, and 30 cubits its height; 3. and the portico ['ûlām] in front of the hall [hékāl] of the house: 20 cubits its width [Heb. length] along the front of the width of the house, 'and' [plus with some MSS, VSS] 10 cubits its depth [Heb. width] along the front of the house. 4. And he made for the house windows 'embrasured, latticed' [?]. 5. And he built on the wall of the house a side-wing about [om. with some VSS the walls of the house about] the hall and the shrine [dēbîr]; and he made stories round about: 6. the lowest 'story' [with some VSS—Heb. side-wing] 5 cubits its width, and the middle one 6 cubits its width, and the third 7 cubits its width, for rebatements were made for the house on the outside, so as not to make inset into the walls of the house; [7. And the house in its building was built with finished stone, quarry-cut, and as for hammers and the saw 'and' [plus with MSS, some VSS] all tools of iron, naught was*

heard in the house at its building—secondary, cf. 5^{31f.}.] **8.** the doorway of the 'lowest' [with some VSS—Heb. *middle*] story at the right side of the house, and by winding-stairs they would go up to the middle (story), and from the middle to the third. **9.** [And he built the house and finished it—secondary, cf. vv.^{14, 38.}] And he ceiled the house in coffers and serried-rafters [?] with cedar beams. [10. And he built the side-wing against all the house, five cubits its height, and it fastened on to the house with timbers of cedar—a gloss to v.⁵.]

The translation above attempts to present the staccato, almost purely substantival diction, as of archival character. The document concerns the structure of the house, walls and roof, as a whole; the inner shrine is mentioned but once. Other non-pertinent items must be regarded as intrusions.

2. The cubit (Engl. 'ell') was according to 2 Ch. 3³ 'after the ancient measure,' in contrast with the later measure of 'a cubit and a hand' (Eze. 40⁵, 43¹³); see BDD, *s.v.* 'Weights and Measures,' the Archæologies of Nowack (§34) and Benzinger (§39), Šanda. The Gr. arbitrarily vary the figures here. Josephus doubles the height, then adds another story of equal dimension, obtaining a height for the temple of 120 cubits, the extravagant figure for the height of the portico in 2 Ch. 3⁴. **3.** The ancient Sumerian word *ēkallu*, Heb. *hēkāl*, used of a royal palace (and so 21¹, etc.), is used of the main chamber, Moffatt quite properly 'nave'; only supplementarily is the rear sanctuary, itself a walled-off chamber, mentioned (v.⁵). **4.** For the obscure adjectives translated *embrasured*, *latticed*, see Note; here and below we have to deal with technical terms of architecture, which may not be explained offhand by etymology. **5.** This last remark is illustrated by the term translated *side-wing* (*yāšî'*); as will appear below, it was early confused, indeed in \mathfrak{H} , with the word for 'story' (*šēla'*); see Note. The word *dēbîr* means radically 'rear-room'; see below, v.¹⁶. **6.** The word translated *story* is primarily 'rib'; the necessary correction of the confusion here has been noted above. Of interest is the meticulous concern lest these side service-chambers (cf. 'the vestry,' II. 10²²) should be structurally part of the house; the beams of the stories rested *on* the recessed walls, not *in* them. **7.** The v. evidently interrupts the architectural specifications;

cf. the punctuation in JV. It is doubtless the fact that all the stone-dressing was done at the quarry (cf. 5^{31. 32}); there may be noted the great semi-detached stone at the Baalbek quarry. 8. The strange error of H which places the doorway on the level of the second story is due to careless confusion of two similar words; even JV makes the correction, noting the Heb. in the margin. *The doorway . . . at the right side of the house*: the question is whether the adj. is used structurally, and so means the north side, or according to the point of the compass, and so the south side. The former view is preferable; cf. the main entrance of the Syrian goddess, which was 'towards the north' (Lucian, §28). *By winding stairs they would go up*. Since the Greek versions the noun has been so rendered in Western translations (see Note); correction of it in line with modern criticism appears in the Moffatt and Chicago Bibles with *trap doors*. The argument against the traditional interpretation was based by Stade on the fact that there was no example of such a construction in ancient Oriental architecture (*Akad. Reden*, 150 f.). But an example has now been discovered, 1939, by Leonard Woolley at Atchana near Antioch in an extensive palace of the eighteenth century B.C. Speaking of one door from the court to the palace he reports: "A stair-well just inside the door contained a newel stair (of which the first two flights were nearly perfectly preserved), whereby one reached the first-floor rooms."¹ The tradition is thus confirmed. There may be compared the remarkable Pancion at Alexandria, a high circular tower with a winding stairway on its exterior, fully described by Strabo (*Geographica*, xvii, 10). 9a. The sentence appears to be quite secondary; the annotator thought of the stone construction, which was first 'finished'; yet an unroofed house is hardly finished, while that verb is used correctly at the end of the specifications (v.³⁸). 9b. The roof is observed from within as the ceiling. The crossing of the rafters at right angles formed hollow squares, in technical phraseology, *coffers*; these may have been further set forth

¹ Cited in *The New York Times*, Aug. 26, 1939, from the *London Times*; cf. Albr., *BASOR* 77 (1940), 23, referring to the report by S. Smith in *The Antiquaries Journal*, 19 (1939), 39 ff. The newel is the centre-post of a winding stairway.

by decoration, as in modern architecture. **10.** The v. is apparently a gloss to v.⁵, with the one fresh item of the height of the side-wing; but a height of five cubits for the three-story structure is absurd. Comm. cited by Poole make the figure refer to the chambers in the several stories (*cf.* Eze. 41⁶), and so AV with Grr. here; RVV JV, Moff., Chic. B., similarly modify the translation. Keil defends the text as a bit of 'Breviloquenz'; Stade turns 'five' into 'fifteen,' which would be a proper figure. The statement is a clumsy insertion by an interpolator who had the figure for the single story in mind.

11-14. VV.¹¹⁻¹³ contain an oracle of the continued divine residence in the house on condition of Solomon's obedience. It is absent in OGrr., and is a late intrusion, repeating 2^{3ff.}, 3¹⁴. See Burney's analysis of the phraseology, showing that the colour is that of P rather than of D. V.¹⁴ repeats v.⁹ on 'the finishing of the house,' introduced because there follow here again items of the cedar work.

1, 37. v.¹ בַּחֹדֶשׁ אוֹ v.³⁷ בִּירוֹחַ, with the older word for 'month,' as exclusively in Ugaritic and Phœn. The Heb. month name is preserved most exactly among the Grr. by MS ο, ζῖου, η, δειου, *cf.* 𐤀, 'Xiuu,' but is otherwise corrupted by dittogr. of preceding [μῆ]ν, resulting in a variety of forms, νισω, νεισω (uncials), νισαν = Ɔ, by identification with Nisan.—Similarly the month name Bul is sadly mishandled by the Grr. here; the Hexaplaric reinsertion of vv.^{37, 38} in their place transliterates the names properly.—**37.** 𐤁𐤓: Grr.: *εθεμελιωσαν-αν*.—**38.** מִשְׁפָּחַי, רִבְרִי: the Grr. read both nouns as sing., and so Ɔ with exegetical translation; 𐤁 𐤀 both as pl.; 𐤅 1⁰ as sing., 2⁰ as pl. It is best to read the latter as מִשְׁפָּחַי. For the interesting secondary sense of this noun *cf.* II. 17.—**2.** 𐤏𐤔𐤕: Grr., '40,' exc. A x, which with Jos., Ɔ = 𐤀.—**5** וְעֵשֶׂת: 5 MSS + אֶתָּה = VSS.—**שֵׁשׁ־עָשָׂר**: Ɔ 𐤄^L = '25,' Jos., '60'; with St., the cause of variation is 'obscure.'—**3.** אֵלַי: so 𐤄^H transliterates; Jos., *πρόναιον*, Sym., *πρόπιλον*; otherwise the Grr. transliterate with αἰλαμ = 𐤁𐤀𐤍, as in Eze. 40, *passim*, accepted by Stade-Haupt, Kit. (not BH), GB, as = Akk. prep. *ellāmu*, 'over against.' But 𐤀 is corroborated by 2 Ch. 3⁴, Eze. 8¹⁶, and is authentic, derived from root 'wl, 'to be in front.'—**הַיְכָל הַבַּיִת**: Ɔ as הַיְכָל, accepted by St.—**עֵשֶׂת**: 15 MSS וְעֵשֶׂת.—**עֵשֶׂת**: Ɔ om., added by 𐤄^L at end of v. = 𐤀 Ɔ.—[הַבַּיִת]: 𐤄 as אֵת, accepted by Klost., Benz., St., BH; but this is an explicative addition.—The Grr., 𐤄^H have repeated v.^{14b} at end of this v.—**4.** חָלוּנֵי שְׁעָרָיו: 'ש' construed with שְׁעָרָיו occurs at 7⁴, and חָלוּנֵי at 7⁵. The Hif. of the verb means 'to look out,' so II. 9^{30, 32} (of

Jezebel at the window), and the derivative here may refer to windows with sides sloping inwards towards one another; *cf.* the embrasures of military fortification. The second questioned word occurs in like connexion, חַמְצָא חַמְצָא, Eze. 40¹⁶, 41¹⁶.²⁶ (see Cooke's Comm.), and comes from a root well known in Aram., Arab.= 'to close, cover,' and may mean 'latticed.' And so the Grr. interpreted the two words: Θ θυριδας παρακλυπτομενας κρυπτας, the ppl. in which Θ^L replaces with δεδικτυωμενας, 'netted, latticed.' Other VSS vary: Τ 'windows open inside and closed outside'; Σ^H 'windows open and closed'; Α 'windows narrow outside, broad inside': Ψ simply, 'obliquas fenestras.' *Cf.* varieties in EVV; JV follows the margin of AV, 'windows broad within and narrow without'; *i.e.*, moderns know little more than the ancients. The VSS read the first word as absolute (and so 1 MS), which construction with the foll. ppls. is required (*cf.* Eze. 40¹⁶), unless with Šanda the second word be read חַמְצָא.—5. חַמְצָא: Grr. read as חַמְצָא.—עַצֵּי, Ḳr. עַצֵּי: a technical term='layer,' and then 'side-layer, wing.' Grr. here μελαθρα (thinking of the cells in the temple?); Σ^H with Syr. borrowing of Gr. ἐπιστύλια, 'architraves.'—אֵה קִירוֹת הַבַּיִת סוּבֵיב: the unnecessary repetition was not known to Τ Θ Θ^L; Theod. (in Σ^H), Σ Α simplify.—חַמְצָא חַמְצָא: B N a₂ v Ḳ om., prob. in view of μελαθρα above.—חַמְצָא חַמְצָא: primarily 'ribs,' then 'stories'; the word occurs at v.¹⁵, 7³, of 'beams' (of cedar); the word appears in Syr. as an architectural term, acc. to Bar-Bahlul's Lex. (ed. Duval, 1886), *s.v.* חַמְצָא, also in Brock., *Lex.*—6. חַמְצָא חַמְצָא: Ḳr. as above; Grr., η πλευρα, *i.e.*, =חַמְצָא=Σ^H, and this must be read. Τ tr. the word here and חַמְצָא, v.⁵, with the one word חַמְצָא חַמְצָא, 'compartment,' etc. (see Jastrow, *Dict.*). But Eze. 41^{5a}. uses חַמְצָא as of a side-chamber. These similar words have contaminated one another. The fem. gender of the foll. adj. supports חַמְצָא here, whereas חַמְצָא is masc. (*cf.* v.¹⁰), although the Mishna treats the word as fem. (Rosenberg, *ZAV* 1905, 331), doubtless by dependence on the Biblical construction.—חַמְצָא חַמְצָא: B *al.*, διαστημα, A M N *al.*, -ματα=Ḳ.—7. חַמְצָא חַמְצָא: St.'s argument (*cf.* BH) that the same phrase occurs at Josh. 8³¹ of 'unhewn stone' would plausibly stamp the adj. as secondary; but the term is qualified by the foll. appositive חַמְצָא.—חַמְצָא חַמְצָא: read חַמְצָא with many MSS, Grr., Σ.—8. חַמְצָא חַמְצָא: Τ Grr., Σ^H=חַמְצָא חַמְצָא, to be accepted; see Comm.—חַמְצָא חַמְצָא: Grr., ἐλικτή ἀνάβασις, 'winding stairway,' and so Τ; Ψ 'coc(h)lea,' 'snail-shell, spiral'; Σ uses the Gr. word for 'cataract.' Etymology has connected the word with Arab. *lawlaba*, 'to wind,' *lawlab*, 'snail-shell' (so Ew. in his *Lehrb.*, §158, b, and König, *Lehrgeb.*, I, 2, 52, recent grammarians ignoring the word). It has been overlooked that Dozy in his *Supplément* presents a parallel Arab. root, *lawlaw*, which supports the origin of the present biliteral from חַמְצָא, 'to wind'; *cf.* also חַמְצָא חַמְצָא, 'girdles,' Ex. 26⁵, etc., poss. Akk. *lūlu* (Bezold, *BAG* 156). For the obscure phrase חַמְצָא חַמְצָא, Eze. 41⁷, Τ renders the second word with חַמְצָא חַמְצָא. It

may be observed that Gr. *λαίλαψ*, 'whirlwind,' otherwise unexplained, comes from this Semitic origin. The interpretation 'hatchways' comes from later Jewish tradition; Talmudic *Mid-doth*, iv, 5, speaks of *לולין פתוחין*, "open *lulin* by which they let down workmen by chains," and Maimonides (cited by Cappel, p. 207) defines *לול* as *פתח קטן*, 'small opening'; cf. also Jastrow, *Dict.*, s.v. for other applications of the word in sense of 'hole.' Similar interpretation has been followed by Benz., Burn., St., Nowack, Šanda, and cf. Sk.—השליש: read *שש*—, with 4 MSS; Grr. read the pl., *τα τριωφωρα*; *Ⓜ* was contaminated from the obscure *בשליש*, Eze 42³, unless the pl. is to be regarded, with Šanda, as 'a standing expression' for the third floor.—9. *ויספן*: for the verb used in the sense of 'ceil' see Jer. 22¹⁴, and cf. Phœn. *בספנת*, 'roof,' and so the verb is used at 7³.—*Ⓞ Ⓞ^L* om.; for the first word Hex. has *φάτνωμα* used of a panelled ceiling = Lat. 'laquear,' used here by *Ⓜ*, which om. the foll. word; *Ⓢ^H* *hērān dappē*, 'ceiling of tables'; *Ⓢ* renders as 'hollows,' and the foll. word as 'sawn'; *Ⓣ* paraphrases remarkably. *גב* is used at II. 3¹⁶, referring to the 'trenches'; it means here the hollow squares between the criss-cross rows, *שררה* (*Ⓢ^H* *tukhāsē*, 'alignments'), of the beams. The noun *gwb* appears in S. Arab. for an architectural feature (Conti Rossini, *Chrest.*, 121).—10. *היציע*, *Ḳr. היציע*: Grr. *τ. ενδεσμους*.—*אה הבית*: B *al.*, *τ. συνδεσμον*, *Ⓞ^L* *τ. ενδεσμους*, A N *al.*, *τ. ενδεσμον* = *Ⓢ^H*; *Ⓣ* 'the gallery' (*תיקא* = Targ. for *בוקקא*, Dt. 22⁵, and *אחיק*, Eze. 41^{15t.}), as 'above all the house'; *Ⓢ* 'circular passage-ways' (*hādārēṭā*) above all the house'; *Ⓜ* 'tabulatum super omnem domum,' i.e., all applying the item quite logically to the roofing of the house; cf. 'the galleries' in Eze. 41¹⁵. The discrepancy of only 5 cubits height for the side-wing has been noted above. Šanda replaces that word with *הצליעות* and reads consequently *קסותן*. Jos. makes the word refer to the side-chambers, which he measures as 5 cubits square, 20 cubits high (see Marcus, *ad loc.*).—11–14. For the Hex. addition see note in MS j.—14. The v. was transferred by *Ⓞ* to end of v.³, was repeated here by Hex.

VV.¹⁵⁻²². The inner wood-work; the partition of the shrine; the decoration.

15. *And he built the walls of the house on the inside with cedar planks from the floor of the house to the [beams] [with OGrr.; Ⓜ walls] of the roof; he panelled with wood within, and he laid the floor of the house with cypress planks.*
18. *And cedar for the house on the inside, carved work of gourds and flower-calyxes; [the whole was cedar, no stone was seen] [OGrr. om.].*

16. *And he built off 20 cubits at the rear of the house with cedar planks from the floor up to the 'beams' [with OGrr. ; H walls], and he built within [with correction of H] for a shrine [H+for the holy of holies];* 17. *and 40 cubits [long] was [H+the house, that is ; OGrr. om.] the hall 'in front of' [with correction of Kr.] 'the shrine' [plus with Grr., H];* 20. *and 'the shrine' [with H ; H in front of the shrine]: 20 cubits in length, and 20 cubits in width, and 20 cubits its height ; and he overlaid it with refined gold. And he 'made' [with Grr. ; H overlaid] an altar of cedar (21b) in front of the shrine, and overlaid it with gold.*
19. *And a shrine within the house, deep within, he prepared, to set there the ark of the covenant of YHWH.*
- 21a. *And Solomon overlaid the house within with refined gold, and he drew chains of gold across.* 22. *And all the house he overlaid with gold, until at last the house was finished. 'And all the altar that belonged to the shrine he overlaid with gold' [OGrr. om.].*

The above display presents in the second column a number of extensive additions that have been interpolated in the text, as also many glosses to the earlier form in the first column. The criticism is largely supported by the OGr. texts, and may in general explain itself. V.¹⁹ parallels v.¹⁶, setting forth the shrine as the depository of the ark. The plus of 'the holy of holies' (v.¹⁶—the Semitic—the holiest) is a current term peculiar to P in the Pentateuch and to the latest Biblical books. VV.^{21a, 22a} are wondrously extravagant with the gold-plating of the whole house. The original specifications concerned the house as a whole ; cf. 'the altar in front of the shrine' (vv. 20. 21b) and the later item of 'the altar of the shrine' (v.^{22b}). With the above independent analysis should be compared Benzinger's elaborate criticism, pp. xvi-xviii.

For the wood-work and decoration may be compared similar specifications in Ass. and Late-Bab. royal inscriptions. Esarhaddon on his Black Stone (col. iv, *ARA* 2, §653) announces: ". . . with mighty beams, products of Mount Amanus [the cedar locality], the snow-capped mountain, I spanned its roof. Door-leaves of cypress [*burāšu*=Heb. *bērōš*], whose odour is pleasant, I bound with a band of gold and silver and hung them in their doors" (*cf.* §659 D). 'Door-leaves of cypress' are again recorded for a palace (*ib.*, §§698, 711); and the last citation proceeds: "The sanctuary of Assur, my lord, I inlaid with gold. *Lahmê* and cherubim of ruddy *sariru* I set side by side. . . . The walls I plastered with gold like plaster." Ashurbanipal, for the rebuilding of his palace, records (Rassam, Cylinder *ib.*, §837): "great beams of cedar . . . door-leaves of juniper . . . with a sheathing of copper . . . tall columns I enclosed with shining bronze and laid (thereon) the cornices of its portico (*bîl-hilāni*)." In the East India House inscription Nebuchadnezzar boasts of the cedar timbers and other woods for the Marduk temple, and expatiates on the gilding; the hall he adorned with 'glowing gold,' where silver had been before; the cedar beams he covered with gold; etc. (cols. ii, iii, *KB* iii, 2, 13 ff.). A text of Esarhaddon's similarly reports work of cypress, cedar, and gold (*ARA* 2, §653). With these inscriptions may be compared the elaboration of the present description in 2 Ch. 3⁵⁻⁹. For the combination of cedar and gilding may be noted Thutmose IV's account of the sacred bark he built, 'all decorated with gold' (*ARE* 2, no. 878, *ATB* I, 92). For a mythical and still more exuberant description, in a Ras Shamra text, of a temple, that of Aleyan-Baal, built of Lebanon cedar and gilded all over with gold and silver, see Virolleaud's publication in *Syria*, 1932, 113 ff.=*RSMT* text B; C. H. Gordon, *Ugaritic Handbook*, 2, Text 51; *cf.* U. Cassuto, 'The Palace of Baal,' *JBL* 1942, 51 ff. For the inner decoration of the wall with plant-themes in Mesopotamian art from ancient times see Andrae, *Das Gotteshaus*, 35 f., 40, Meissner, *Bab. u. Ass.*, 2, 330 (*e.g.*, 'palm-leaves and pomegranates'). Such decoration abounded in Egyptian architecture. Capitals with lily ornamentation have now been found at Megiddo (*ILN* May 26, 1934, 836 f.), and the Oriental VSS so understand the word rendered above as 'flower.' The

word translated above as 'gourds' (EVV with archaic 'knops' = 'knobs,' see A. R. S. Kennedy, *s.v.*, *DB*) is uncertain; that rendering is based on etymological relation with the word for 'gourds' (II. 4³⁹); see GB for variant opinion. \mathcal{T} tr. with 'eggs,' recalling the common egg-ornamentation of capitals since ancient times. The same detail appears on the bronze sea (7²⁴). Solomon's temple differed from those in Egypt and Mesopotamia in being wainscotted with wood, in contrast to stone and tile interiors.

The whole house is roofed, panelled, and floored with wood; the flooring is of cypress; the rest of the construction, in cedar. The shrine or sanctuary (see Note for the various translations) is a cube of 20 cubits; for such proportion *cf.* the Meccan Ka'ba (*i.e.*, 'dice-cube'), which is 12 \times 12 m. square, 15 m. high; see Gaudefroy-Demombynes, *Le pèlerinage à Mekke* (1926), 26. The figure for the length of the hall agrees with the dimensions given above (v.³). Nothing is said about the presumed vacant loft above the sanctuary; Ch. knows of it as containing gilded 'upper-chambers' (II. 3⁹), and *Middoth* iv, 5, reports for the Herodian temple hatchways through which workmen were lowered into the sanctuary. Galling, 'Das Allerheiligste in Salomo's Tempel,' *JPOS* 1932, 43 ff., denies existence of such an upper chamber, and postulates a raised podium for the *dēbīr*, with steps leading up to the latter. The gilding of the furnishings, as of the altar, is reasonable, but not that of the whole interior; *cf.* Stade, and Nowack, *Arch.*, 2, 29, n. 1. Šanda attempts to support the description, referring to Hezekiah's tribute to Sennacherib; but for the text as *vs.* the usual translation see Comm., II. 18¹⁶. Such extravagant description appears to be a step forward in the process of exuberant imagination, continued by the Chronicler, for whose fancy even the 120-cubit high portico was overlaid with fine gold (2 Ch. 3^{4ff.}). *Refined gold* (v.²⁰): the pass. ppl. translates a word of Akk. origin, and is technical for a certain specie value. For the *chains of gold* see Note; the word is different from that at 7¹⁷ (*cf.* EVV). For the *altar in front of the shrine* *cf.* the altar, with dimensions given, in Eze.'s plan (41²²), and the incense altar specified in Ex. 30^{1ff.}, of acacia wood, with dimensions given, to be placed "before the veil that is by the ark of the testimony." In the citation from

Eze. (see Cooke, *ad loc.*) there is the further specification of the Guide that "this is the table which is before YHWH," thus complicating our altar with the table of showbread; *cf.* the reference inserted below (7¹⁸) to both a golden altar and a golden showbread-table. Herodotus (i, 183) refers to a golden altar in the temple of Bel in Babylon. The word for altar (from the root 'to slaughter') has become generalized, and no longer imports the kind of offering made upon it. This altar may be identified with the altar of incense in the *hēkāl* at which Uzziah presumptuously officiated (2 Ch. 26^{16ff.}, *cf.* Luke 1^{8ff.}). For such table-altars see K. Galling, *Der Altar in den Kulturen des alten Orients* (1925), 68 ff., with plates; *ATB* 2, plates clxxv *seq.*; H. Wiener, *The Altars of the O.T.* (1927), 23 ff., for incense altars, with plate illustrating the incense altars found at Gezer, Taanach, Shechem; Albright, *APB* 108, notes p. 200; for general discussion, *cf.* Nowack, *Arch.*, 2, 39 f.; and Morgenstern, *HUCA* 12-13 (1937-38), 7 f. At 8⁶⁴ (*cf.* vv.²²⁻⁵⁴) we learn casually of 'the bronze altar before YHWH'; see Comm. on the passage. The innovations and reformations (*e.g.*, II, 21, 23) that proceeded through the four centuries of the temple's existence preclude the rigorous application of later data, and especially of theoretical plans like those in Ex. and Eze., for illumination of the present antique record.

15. מביה : 𐤄 𐤅 om.; St., Kit. (not BH) excise; but with Burn., Šanda, the word is essential, indicating the inner construction.—צלעות: the technical word in another sense at v.⁵.—קרקע: 'floor'; *cf.* Num. 5¹⁷.—ער קירח: 22 MSS Ken., deR., וער=Grr., exc. x. 𐤄 𐤅=קירח וער קירח, *i.e.*, an early double rdg.; 𐤄^H obelizes the first term, agreeing with 𐤄; קורות, 'beams,' is required, as also at v.¹⁶.—צפה עץ מביה: Klost., St., *al.* regard as an addition (*cf.* BH); otherwise Burn., Šanda.—ברושים: the genus is uncertain; see Comm., 6^{15ff.}; Post in *DB* renders with the inclusive word 'fir' (*v. sub voce*). The lumber for the floor is other than that for the roof; *cf.* the list of woods used in ship-building, Eze. 27^{5f.}.—16. מירבותי: 𐤀𐤓𐤁 [אח עשרים] אמה, but for the construction see GK, §117, d.—מירבותי: 𐤀𐤓𐤁 correctly in 𐤀𐤓𐤁, and so many MSS Kt.—הביה: Grr. by clumsy error, τ. τοιχου=𐤄^H, exc. 𐤄 τ. οικου.—בצלעת ארזים: Grr., το πλευρον το εν=𐤄^H, a remarkable interpretation, so St., *q.v.*—קירח: read קורות.—ויבן 2⁰: Grr., 𐤄^H 𐤅 'and he made,' an exegetical variation.—ויבן לו מביה לרבו: 𐤄 𐤅 ignore; Hex., αυτω, var. αυτο; 𐤀 𐤄 after Aram. use regard the phrase as accusative, anticipating

the foll. acc. ; Junius (in Poole) as= ' for God ' ; JV ' for himself,' and so Burn., interprets it as *dativus commodi*, referring to the king's privilege as pontifex maximus, but this would be arrogance. St. refrains from altering. Šanda reduces the phrase to לַבְּנֵי לְרִבְרִי, regarding the verb as superfluous ; but by retaining the verb and with his further correction a suitable sense is obtained, as in the tr. above.—רִבְרִי: the Grr. transliterate the word here and below with *δαβειρ* (=Σ^H), and for the nominal phrase Ⓞ texts have *εκ του δ.* (Ⓞ^L+τ. τοιχοσ), but Ⓞ^H *εσωθεν του δ.*=Σ^H. For the word as radically= ' rear part ' see Burn., who notes the history of its transliteration. Aq., Sym., *χρημασθηριον*=Ⓞ ' oraculum '= AV RVV FV ' oracle ' ; Ⓞ ' house of atonement '—the same for cover of the lid of the ark, Ex. 25¹⁷ ; JV ' Sanctuary ' ; GV most ingeniously, ' Chor.'—17. [ההיכל] : הַבַּיִת הַזֶּה : Ⓞ Ⓞ^L om., and in fact the house was not the hall.—לְפָנַי: the pointing is impossible (= 'before me'), indicative of the dilemma of the Masoretes ; *n.b.* 1 MS deR., לַפְּנֵי=Ⓞ ; cf. EVV ' before the oracle/Sanctuary.' The introduction to v.²⁰, וּלְבֵנֵי הַרְבִּיר, an impossible clause in the connexion (cf. the attempts of EVV, exc. JV), is survival of original לַבְּנֵי הַרְבִּיר at the end of this v., represented by the fragment לַבְּנֵי, and this by early corruption affected the original beginning of v.²⁰=וּהַרְבִּיר.—18. The intrusion of this v., absent in Ⓞ Ⓞ^L, and of v.¹⁹, early disturbed the text ; see tr. above, which follows St.—אֵל הַבַּיִת: the prep. is remarkable ; 2 MSS על ; Burn. tries to explain ; Ⓞ ingeniously understood as בל. בקלעה פקיעם. בל also at vv.²⁹⁻³². The VSS distinguish פַּת as in abs. form, gaining three motives of decoration. Ⓞ tr. פֶּקֶץ with ' eggs ' ; Ⓞ Ⓞ Ⓞ for 'ז ' lilies.'—19. לַחֲתָן: error for לַחֲתָן or לַחֲתָן ; cf. erroneous חתן, 17¹⁴.—20. קְנֹר=זָהָב כְּנֹר, Job 28¹⁵ ; the term= Akk. *hurāsu sagru* (Bezold, *BAG* 210) ; for the mng. of פַּת see Note on כְּנֹר, II. 24¹⁴.—וַיִּצֶף: read וַיִּצֶף with Grr. ; OGrr. rearrange vv.^{20b-21}.—21. בְּרִחְקֹת Kt., בְּרִחְקֹת Křr. ; at Is. 40¹⁹ רְחֻקֹת= ' chains,' and so here Ⓞ ; רְחֻקֹת, Eze. 7²³, is most obscure ; see Cooke, Comm. ; Hex. here ' nails,' and so Ⓞ, as of applying gold foil with nails, which item seems to have come from 2 Ch. 3⁹. Šanda accepts Then.'s suggestion to read הַצִּיּוֹת, ' the veil,' as at 2 Ch. 3¹⁴ ; but how could so well known a technical term have become obscured ? The second half of the v. is omitted by OGrr.—22b. The sentence, omitted by OGrr., is represented in Hex. with " and all within the *dabir* he overlaid with gold."

VV.²³⁻²⁷. The two cherubs in the shrine.

23a. *And he made in the shrine two cherubs of oleaster wood : 26. the height of the one cherub 10 cubits, and so the second cherub (23b) ten cubits its height ; 24. and five cubits (long) the one wing of the cherub, and five cubits the second wing of the cherub, 10 cubits from end of its [wing] to end of its [wing]*

[**¶** wings]; 25. [and ten cubits the second cherub—repetition] one measure and one form to the two cherubs. 27. [And he set the cherubs within the inner house—secondary, repeating v.^{23a}.] And they spread out 'their wings' [with OGr. ; **¶** the wings of the cherubs], and the wing of the one touched the (side-) wall, and the wing of the other [Heb. second] cherub was touching the other [Heb. second] wall, with their wings in the centre of the house, touching wing to wing.

The text is fairly intact, with the necessity of transfer of v.²⁶ into v.²³ (with Stade and subsequent comm.) and of excision of an evident doublet (v.^{27a}), which is dependent upon Eze.'s peculiar term for the *dēbīr* (41¹⁷), and avoids the 'making' of the cherubs in the holy place.

Since antiquity the cherub figures have been subject of mystical interest—indeed with later artistic degradation of the theme—even as they remain to-day one of technical dispute. The obscure word *kērūb* has been finally etymologized by Langdon as from the Akk. root='to adore,' from which was developed the noun *karebāti* (fem. pl.—also a form *kurebu*), used in association with *lamasāti*, the protecting genii in sculptured form at entrance of temples.¹ The problem is complicated by the kaleidoscopic forms of the figure depicted elsewhere in the Bible. Ezekiel (10¹⁴⁻²¹) presents four cherubs each with four faces, four wings, and so expanding the vision of ch. 1; according to Ex. 25^{18ff.} the two golden cherubs at the ends of the ark screen the *kappōret* with their wings, *i.e.*, as guardians, and this feature since Josephus has largely entered into reconstructions of the picture of Solomon's cherubs. However, the item in the present specifications is long anterior to those later figments, doubtless developed under impressions from Bab. art, its historicity being established by its independence of them, and it may justly be

¹ In addition to the literature cited above, Comm., v.¹, see S. Langdon, *Epic of Creation* (1923), 190, n. 1; Dhorme and Vincent, 'Les chérubins,' *RB* 35 (1926), 328 ff., 481 ff.; Cooke, *Ezekiel*, 112 ff.; also for general discussions Gressmann, *Die Lade Jahves* (1920) with 10 plates, and H. Schmidt, 'Kerubenthron u. Lade,' *Gunkel-Eucharisterion*, 1, 120 ff. For such winged figures in general, cherub, griffin, sphinx, see L. Waterman, *AJSL* 31 (1915), 249 ff., who supports the connexion of the word 'cherub' with *γρίψ* (but see below); Cook, *Rel. of Anc. Pal.*, 47 ff.; and Galling's summary art., 'Mischwesen,' in *BR*.

explained from earlier native and primitive language. YHWH has the ancient epithet of "seated on the cherubs" (II. 19¹⁵ = Is. 37¹⁶; Ps. 80¹, 99¹), and these winged creatures constitute his heavenly chariot, as in the theophany in 2 Sam. 22^{8ff.} = Ps. 18^{8ff.}, according to which "he rode upon a cherub and flew, and swooped down on the wings of the wind," while the naturalistic basis of the theme appears in Ps. 104³: YHWH "makes the clouds his chariot." And this original form of the theme recurs in 1 Ch. 28¹⁸, 'the pattern of the chariot, the cherubs' (with probable play on *kērūb* and *merkābāh*, cf. Dhorme and Vincent, p. 329); that is, the cherubs are bearers of the Deity. And as such they appear in the present artistic composition, standing with their wings stretched out to the full width of the sanctuary, constituting the throne of the Presence. They stand erect, without doubt 'in human likeness' (so Eze. 1⁵), 'on their feet' (2 Ch. 3¹³), 10 cubits in height, with the same space above, which is empty, to the mystical imagination for the session of the Deity.² This is in contrast to the drooping, protective wings of the ancient Oriental art, and the independence of the Solomonic cherubs from those visualized in the later literature is to be insisted upon. There may be noted in the relief accompanying the Yehaumilk inscription the overshadowing of the two figures with an evident pair of wide-spreading wings. *N.b.* the transfer of the wings to Deity himself, Ps. 17⁸, and see Gunkel at length, *ad loc.* The present scene retains the natural simplicity of the Deity riding on the wings of the wind. And indeed too much stress may not be laid upon Mesopotamian art and etymology. The cherub was native to Phœnician religious language, as appears in Eze. 28¹⁴, and the root of the word appears, as noted by Dhorme and Vincent, in the far-flung Ethiopic, in *mekrab*, 'sanctuary.'

VV.²⁸⁻³⁰. An addition of extravagant details. The gilding of the cherubs would be in place at v.²³, the item depending upon the 'golden cherubs' of Ex. 25¹⁸; the gilding of the floor is absurd. The figuration of the decoration of the house *inside and out* depends literally upon Eze. 41^{17f.} in the details of cherubs and palm-trees; the *flower-calyxes*, repeating v.¹⁸, do not appear in the OGrr. For the decoration, recalling the

² Josephus arbitrarily reduces the height to 5 cubits.

winged genii who fertilize the palm-tree in Ashurnasirpal's temple at Nimrud, see Cook, p. 53, Cooke on Eze. 41¹⁷.

24. כנפי כנפי *bis*: read כנפי with VSS; the pl. was induced by regard of קצית as pl.—25. קעב: in this mng. again 7³⁷.—27. רופשו: Grr., exc. N h i, as sing., by early error.—כנפי הכרובים: read with 6 כנפיהם; the corruption caused by 2 Ch. 3¹³.—29. כנפ a noun used as adv., *vs.* כנפ of the old document, v. 5; St. would correct to כנפיהם.—הזרה: a technical word used elsewhere only by Eze., Ch.; for its unique vocalization, a diminutive form, see GB.—לְקַצֵּיט: with odd vocalization; but לפניה v. 30. Then., Burn., St. would correct to לְקַצֵּיט in correspondence with the parallel Eze. 41¹⁷.

VV.³¹⁻³⁵. The portals and doors of shrine and hall.

31. *And the doorway of the shrine: he made doors of oleaster wood, the portal [H + jambs] a pentagon.*

33. *And so he made for the doorway of the hall: jambs of oleaster wood [H + obscure particle], a tetragon; 34. and two doors of cypress wood, two leaves the one door, folding, and two leaves the second door, folding.*

32. *and two doors of oleaster wood, and he carved upon them carvings of cherubs and palm-trees and lily-calyxes; and he overlaid gold, and he plated the gold upon the cherubs and palm-trees.*

35. *And he carved cherubs and palm-trees and lily-calyxes, and he overlaid with gold, applied to the graving.*

VV.³²⁻³⁵ are displayed above as literarily secondary (*cf.* Stade), for reasons similar to the criticism of vv.¹⁵⁻²²; and yet the data have authentic colour. The particular artistic care for portal and doors is illustrated by Nebuchadnezzar's East India House inscription cited above (Comm., vv.^{15ff.}). "Door-leaves of cedar wood with copper overlay, thresholds and hinges of bronze in their doors I erected. Mighty bull-colossi of bronze and mighty serpent-forms I placed at their

entrance. These doors I furnished with beauty, for the wonder of the hosts of people" (col. vi). Quite similar is Nabonidus's enthusiastic description of the doors in the restored temple of Marduk, concluding with the boast that he "made them bright as the day" (Messerschmidt, *MVÄG* 1896, no. 1, col. viii, 31 ff.). Similar artistic care was applied by the Egyptians to doorways of temples, tombs, etc., with reliefs heightened by brilliant colours, and also with metal inlay; see O. Königsberger, *Die Konstruktion der ägyptischen Tür (Ägyptologische Forschungen, Heft 2, 1936, with 15 plates)*. For the end of v.³¹ more particular reference should be made to the Notes. The word translated *portal* is ignored in the VSS, exc. **⊔**, and appears at Eze. 40⁹, etc., with mng. 'jambs,' and hence the gloss-insertion of this word here (*cf.* Burney). For the difficulties *cf.* the several English translations. The pentagonal doorway, *i.e.*, with a peaked roof, is illustrated on a coin of Byblos (A.D. 217), presenting such a temple doorway (Contenau, *La civilization phénicienne*, 86; *cf.* p. 108; Cook, *Rel. of Anc. Palestine*, pl. xxxiii). **32.** The statement of the heavy gilding of the doors here and v.³⁵ is corroborated for a later age by II. 18¹⁶, detailing how in addition to his heavy tribute "Hezekiah cut off the doors of the temple of YHWH and the door-posts which H. king of Judah had overlaid, and gave them to the king of Assyria," *i.e.*, these of value for the gold-overlay. **33.** For the four-square vestibule *cf.* the ceramic model of a Cyprian temple presented by Contenau, p. 87. **34.** For the folding two-leaved doors within the large doors, inserted for convenience of ordinary entrance, the like in Christian architecture may be compared. Esarhaddon boasts more than once of 'door-leaves of cypress' (cited above, Comm., vv.^{15ff.}). For the heavy doors and inevitable stone door-sockets in Mesopotamian architecture, see Andrae, *Das Gotteshaus*, pp. 32, 36. **35.** The last two terms in the v. are technical; as Šanda remarks, the gold was applied only to the incised lines.

36. The construction of the wall of the temple court. *And he built the inner court: three courses of hewn stone to [=⊔ and] a course of beams of cedars.* This was the area in front of the temple, enclosing the sacred stone and the great altar, the place of convocation for the people (ch. 8). 'The other

court' (7⁶) contained Solomon's palaces, and 'the great court' (7^{9. 12}) would have included those courts and a more extensive area. For the proposed plans see the literature cited above in introduction to the ch. Interpretation of the specifications, repeated for the great court (7¹²) has greatly varied; see Castel in Walton's *Apparatus*, Thenius, Šanda, *et al.* The most apparent sense is that of three layers of stone, capped by a layer of wood, but to what purpose this covering? Or, it has been suggested, occasional upright palisades between the stones, or rows of stones with an inner facing of wood (so Šanda). But the construction is similar to that expressed for the building of the second temple, 'with three courses of great stone and a row of new timber' (Ezra 6⁴), in which the timber was used for alignment of the courses. Such construction is corroborated by the discovery of layers of wood between the stone-courses in the city wall of Senjirli, and of wood with brick layers above (Watz., *DP* 1, 97, 99). According to personal communication from E. A. Speiser such construction was common at Ashur, Tell Billah, Tepe Gawra. The height of the wall is not herewith presented.¹

37. 38. These vv., here in their original place, have been treated, for convenience, at the beginning of the ch. For the annalistic dating of completion of a temple *cf.* the item in the Ass. Eponym List for 787 B.C., when "Nabu entered the new house," the rebuilding of the house having been recorded for the preceding year (*KB* 1, 211; *ARA* 2, 434).

31. וַיִּבְנֶה הַמֶּלֶךְ שֹׁמֵרִים: acc. *ad sensum*; see GK §117, m, and for the corresponding extensive Arabic use Wright's *Grammar*, 2, §35.— עָצֵי שֶׁמֶן (v. 33) . . . הָאֵיל : Ⓞ (B a₂) Ⓞ om. by parablepsis due to foll. identical phrase.— הָאֵיל כְּמוֹת- : the Gr. ignore the first noun, which Ⓞ read as אֵלֶיךָ, 'but.' Ⓞ 'iuniperi et limina,' Ⓞ 'postesque angulorum.' For אֵיל in Eze. see Cooke on 40⁹, etc., the text confusing it with אֵילִם. But etymologically the word is of the same origin, and means 'projection,' and so it may mean the upper lintel, gable, with Kimchi (so the Aram. mng. acc. to Buxtorf, Jastrow), and

¹ The explanation given above of the wood as bonding to the stone courses is supported by Barrois in his *Manuel*, p. 14. See now for the whole problem S. Smith, 'Timber and Brick or Masonry Construction,' with Add. Note by C. F. A. Schaeffer, *PEQ* 1941, 5 ff. Smith, with extensive criticism of Ezra 6⁴, denies for the present passage the bonding with wood, regarding the latter as only 'surface ornament' (p. 14).

then, supplying conj. and article with the foll. noun = 'the lintel and the jambs pentagonal'; but it is preferable, with Burn., to regard the asyndetic 'jambs' as a gloss, and to understand our noun as the projecting framework, porch, of the doorway. The word may have been added in order to picture the side-posts.—הַמְשִׁיחַ: parallel to רִבְעִיָה, v. 33; in the latter case Ⓞ, rendering with *στοαι τετραπλως*, read the numeral adverbially as in Ⓣ, and so supports the latter, vs. Šanda's correction to adjectives, רִבְעִיָה, הַמְשִׁיחַ. St. remains uncertain. The adv. means 'pentagon-wise'; for similar adverbial use of such forms see GK §100, 3.—כְּוֹתוֹת: for Akk. origin see Schwally, *ZDMG* 52, 134.—32. *N.b.* late syntax of וְקָלַעַ, וְנִפְחָ, and so at v. 35.—עַל־יָהִם: for the irregular masc. suffix is to be noted the study by M. G. Slonim, 'The Substitution of the Masc. for the Fem. Heb. Pronominal Suffixes to Express Reverence,' *JQR* 29 (1939), 397 ff., and so here of a holy thing; he notes in *Ki.* also 7²⁸. 30. 31, II. 16¹⁷, 18¹⁶. For this irregularity see further Note to וַיִּרְדּוּ.—וַיִּרְדּוּ: from root וַיִּרְדּוּ, 'to spread,' used in the Targum as equivalent to Heb. וַיִּרְדּוּ (Burn.).—33. כַּאֲשֶׁר רִבְעִיָה: since Then. there has been generally accepted the emendation to כְּוֹתוֹת רִבְעִיָה on basis of the Grr., but the corruptions were hardly possible; it is best to cancel כַּאֲשֶׁר, and to regard ׀ as parallel to הַמְשִׁיחַ above.—34. קַלְעִים: a misspelling for זַלְעִים (so *Ken.* 150, and as all translations understand), under O.Aram. influence, where original *q* appears as *k*.—36. Grr. *ad finem* plus *κυκλοθεν* (which St. adopts in the text with כְּבִיבִי), and a long addition.—38. See above after v. 1.

Ch. 7¹⁻¹². Solomon's palaces. *Cf. Ant.*, viii, 5, 2. OGrr. transferred this description of secular constructions to the end of the ch., while Jos. further defers it, after the history of ch. 8, for still more pronounced distinction. See the classic studies by Stade in *ZAW* 3=*Akad. Reden*, 159 ff., *GVI* 1, 318 ff., with architectural plans, which have been reproduced at large in subsequent publications; the *Archæologies* of Nowack (1, 255 ff.) and Benzinger (pp. 211 ff.), and the latter's art., 'Palace' in *EB* (these with earlier bibliography); Th. Friedrich, *Tempel u. Palast Salomos*, 1887; G. Richter, 'Der salomonische Königspalast,' *ZDPV* 1917, 171-225, with two plates, offering original reconstructions (criticized by Watzinger as "eine architektonische unmögliche Wiederherstellung"); C. Van Gelderen, 'Der salomonische Palastbau,' *Afo* 6 (1930-31), 100 ff., with text-critical study; and in particular, as from a technical expert, Watzinger, *DP* 1, 95 ff.

1. *And Solomon, having built his house for thirteen years, finished all his house*: so more exactly after the Hebrew syntax

than in the usual translations. The word 'house' is used of the complex of buildings. In 9¹⁰ the present '13' and the '7' of 6³⁸ are editorially summed up as 'twenty years,' as though the building of the king's house was subsequent to that of YHWH's house. V.^b is transferred by OGr. to the end of the specifications, after the Greek sense of better order. The position of the v. appears to be secondary; note its syntactical dependence in the Heb. upon 6³⁸. As Van Gelderen remarks, Solomon's completion of the whole operation is exceptional in ancient history. For parallels to such a palace-complex cf. the explorations at Senjirli (*Ausgrabungen in Sendschirli*, vol. 4, plates xlix, 1); at Samaria (Reisner, *Excavations at Samaria*, vol. 2, plate 5); and the recent uncovering of the far earlier, more extensive and beautifully decorated palace at Mari on the upper Euphrates; see A. Parrot, *Syria*, 1937, 54 ff.; 1938, 8 ff.; 1939, 14 ff., all articles with numerous plates and photographs (cf. *ILN*, May 28, 1938). Parrot reports that he has uncovered some 220 rooms and courts of a building extending over more than five acres. The stress laid here upon windows and doors reveals the novel *hilāni* architecture of Syria, for which are to be compared the palaces at Senjirli (see von Luschan). For the Mesopotamian field brief reference may be made to the lengthy and glowing inscriptions celebrating the palace-construction of many monarchs; e.g., Tiglath-pileser III, with his reference to his 'palace of cedar . . . patterned after a Hittite (*i.e.*, Syrian) palace,' such artistry being boasted of by subsequent monarchs (*ARA* 1, no. 804); Sargon (*ARA* 2, nos. 83 ff., 121, referring to palaces of ivory, marble, etc., and no. 138, of a palace used as a treasure-house); Sennacherib (*ARA* 2, *in extenso*, e.g., nos. 382-94, 407-33, *n.b.* no. 429, according to which the palace is both an armoury and a store-house for booty); cf. Olmstead, *HA* 318 ff., with map of the palace complex.

For the archival character of the following document is to be noted the series of items without immediate verbal government (supplied in EVV), *viz.* 'and the porch of pillars' (v.⁶—the following verb 'he made' is secondary, as also in v.⁷), 'and the porch of the throne' (v.⁷), 'and his house where he was to dwell' (v.^{8a}), 'and a house for Pharaoh's daughter'

(v.^{8b}—om. with **6** the impossible Heb., 'he will make'), and also the following purely nominal statements. Cf. the syntax in vv.¹⁵⁻²⁰.

2. *And he built the House of the Lebanon Forest: 100 cubits its length, and 50 cubits its width, and 30 cubits its height (storied), upon four [Grr. three] rows of pillars of cedars, and beams [Grr. capitals] of cedars upon the pillars; 3. and roofed with cedar above, over the side-chambers that were upon the pillars—forty-five, fifteen to a row; 4. and embrasured windows, three rows, and looking towards each other [Heb.=vis-à-vis] in triplicate; 5. and all the doorways, and the jambs squared—[embrasure?] and opposite, looking towards each other in triplicate; 6. and the portico of pillars [H+he made], 50 cubits its width [Heb. length] and 30 cubits its depth [Heb. breadth], 'and a portico in front of them' [?], and pillars, and a cornice above them; 7. and the portico of the throne where he was to judge, the Portico of Justice [H+he made; OGrr. om.], and panelled with cedar from floor to floor; 8. and his own house, where he was to dwell—the second court—within the portico, after the same fashion; and the house [H+he was going to make; OGrr. om.] for Pharaoh's daughter [whom Solomon married—a gloss] like this portico; 9. all these (of) cut [EVV costly] stones, 'according to hewing specifications' [OGrr. om.], sawn with a saw on the inside and outside faces, and (disposed) from foundation to 'the eaves' [?], 'and outside unto the great court' [?]; 10. and founded with cut [EVV costly] stones, great stones, stones of ten and eight cubits (in length); 11. and above stones hewn according to hewing specifications, and cedar; 12. and the great court round about, three courses of hewn stone, and a course of timbers of cedars, 'and for the inner court of the House of YHWH, and for the portico of the house' [?].*

2-7. The House of the Lebanon Forest. The æsthetic name was taken from its cedar construction. **T** makes it 'a house of cooling' (cf. Jud. 3²⁰), and this interpretation was developed by Kimchi into a summer palace in Mount Lebanon. The purpose of the building and its relation to the subsequent items has long been a matter of dispute; to summarize Watzinger's statement: The record of these buildings is so abbreviated and contradictory that all attempts at a plausible reconstruction are wrecked, and it is evident that the tradition

preserved memoranda only of notable elements. Interpretation of the specifications depend critically upon text (*e.g.*, 'four,' v.²), and interpretation (*e.g.*, the word, v.³, translated 'beams' in EVV, 'side-chambers' in JV), and syntactical reference (*e.g.*, 'forty-five,' v.³). Josephus held that the building was a great hall of justice, and Šanda follows suit, obtaining by the translation 'architraves' in place of 'side-chambers' a building of "imposante Grossartigkeit," comparable with the Roman basilica or the mosque at Cordova. But the subsequent reff. to this building by name indicate that it was a royal store-house; at 10¹⁷ we read of the 300 shields of gold placed in this house, evidently for decoration, while Is. 22⁸ definitely refers to 'the armour in the House of the Forest,' kept there for military purposes, and this interpretation appears here in A, 'a house for his weapons.' That such was the objective is now generally accepted, and it is supported and brilliantly illustrated by Watzinger (p. 96) from the description of a plan by the Greek architect Philon (*ca.* 350 B.C.) for a magazine at Athens, as reproduced by Dörpfeld; this building was a vast, long, three-naved hall, supported by Ionic columns in two rows; the lower space was an open chamber, in the upper story the side naves on the breadth (short sides) of the house were formed in two-story store-rooms, while in the upper part of the ends of the long sides were windows opposite windows for lighting the interior. Watzinger properly insists upon the close relationship of Solomon's and Philon's plans. For the three-nave construction of megara in the ancient Levant see H. Thiersch, 'Ein altmediterraner Tempeltyp,' *ZAW* 1932, 73 ff., with accompanying plates. The present writer presents below his own reconstruction of the vague description, with preference for many a question-mark in lieu of text-correction. It is to be remarked that the description comes from a spectator of the visible interior.

The dimensions of the interior, 100×50 cubits, follow the common proportions of the ancient megaron, etc. (*cf.* Watzinger, p. 90). Four rows of cedar pillars appear, the first and the fourth of which rows must have been set as pilasters against the walls, affording three aisles, while all the upper wooden construction was based upon the several two pairs of the four

rows of columns. Above each of the two pairs of columns in their long parallelism were built-in rooms in stories, leaving a lofty nave, which afforded a view of the cedar roof stretching over the width of the building. The terminal walls at the ends of each of the three aisles were pierced with doors (*in triplicate*), and above with three superimposed windows. With this specification of storied windows it appears that the built-in stories did not extend to the terminal walls, and at these open ends may well have stood the staircases to the upper stories, while the open spaces afforded light.

2. The specification of *four rows of pillars* has been generally corrected by comm. (Stade, *et al.*, not by Richter, Van Gelderen, Watzinger) to 'three rows' with Grr., in view of the equal division of the assumed *forty-five pillars, fifteen to a row, v.³*. But the three last-named authorities assign the *forty-five* to the number of chambers in the stories, and this interpretation is the most reasonable in the syntax of the v., although the assignment of the number of chambers appears unimportant, and the odd numbers 45 and 15 raise a question as to the division of the chambers on the two sides; the only explanation is that the observation has to do with one side of the nave, on which side there were three stories each with fifteen rooms, and this would provide closets of close to ten feet in width. For this and the foll. vv. see the Notes at length. The word *beams* appeared at 6³⁶; comm., following the Grr., largely correct it to 'capitals,' with which *cf.* C and Jos., who amusingly find in it a transcription from a Greek word.

3. *Side-chambers*: so at 6⁵, but at 6¹⁵ used of cedar boards; *cf.* EVV. 4. The initial adjective 'embrasured' appeared at 6⁴. 5. For the opening words a simplification may be proposed: *and all the doorways squared, embrasured and opposite*, etc.; *cf.* Note. The sum of the statement is that the three doors at the opposite ends faced one another; the addition of 'windows' with commentators, after the Grr., would only repeat v.⁴. 6. The v. evidently describes the pillared portico in front of this house, its width of 50 cubits agreeing with that of the house. V.^{6b} appears to present a pillared vestibule in front of that great portico, and so V paraphrases: 'another portico in front of that greater portico'; but the description as a whole is unintelligible. Kittel om. translation of v.^b,

Sanda om. as secondary, 'and a portico in front of them and the pillars,' and indeed the repetition of the identical Heb. phrase, which must be translated variously as *in front of them* and *upon them*, looks like a dittograph. Van Gelderen translates at end: 'and to wit (und zwar) pillars with a roof over them'—he holds that these rows of columns are a continuation of those in the interior. Klostermann by a change of vocalization of וֹ הַעַמּוּדִים changes 'the pillars' into 'the courtiers,' making the building a reception hall—to be noted as a clever suggestion. 7. After the evidently frontal *portico* of v. 6 the word here must have another significance, probably that of the Gate, the Porte, *i.e.*, of justice, as in common Oriental language, and so expressed in the following exact term, *the Portico of Justice*. This chamber was distinct, wholly panelled with cedar and roofed; its position in the House of the Lebanon Forest may have lain at the other end of the building from the front portico, and the clients of royal justice had then to pass through the length of the imposing portico and great hall. Šanda regards the portico and this audience chamber as a distinct building. For the magnificent throne this chamber was to house see 10^{18ff.} 8. The private palaces, the Harem in the Arabic language, of which as a matter of taste little might be said, are listed. They lie in a separate enclosure, *the second court*, as distinguished from the royal public buildings (v. 12).

Ch. 9²¹ records the queen's entrance into her palace.

9-10. The actual material of these buildings—all of stone (as for the temple, *cf.* 5^{31f.}), hewn according to given measurements, with the upper blocks above the basement cut so as to expose a smooth surface on the outside and inside walls, the foundation stones being particularly specified as to their dimensions; the timbering was of cedar. The present register is well illustrated by the excellent summary review of the remains of stone construction at Samaria given by Watzinger, vol. 1, pp. 98 ff., based upon the Harvard excavations. 9. As against the usual translation 'costly stones' see Note, 5³¹. The final phrase is unintelligible; with correction of text Stade would read, 'and from the house of YHWH to the great court'; Burney, 'and from the court of the house,' etc.; Šanda, 'and from the second court to the great court';

Richter and Van Gelderen, 'and indeed from the street to the great court,' conjecturing apparently a long view of the palaces up through the great court. 12. V.^a repeats the specifications for the walls of the inner court, that of the temple (6³⁶); for these courts see Comm. there. V.^{12b} is absent in OGrr.; no sense can be made of the unconstruable words; cf. the makeshifts in EVV. The topography is so uncertain that *the house*, while generally identified with the temple, is claimed to be the palace by Burney, Richter, Van Gelderen.

2. 'and 30 cubits its height': 𐤂 𐤂^L om., 𐤂^H ✱, but Jos. has.—על: 𐤂 και, by early scribal error.—ארבעה: Grr. as 'three,' influenced by the numerals below, largely accepted by critics, e.g., St., BH; but Jos. = 𐤂, making of the phrase 'quadrangular pillars' (!).—כרתות: Grr., ὠμῖαι, 'shoulder-pieces' = כתפות, as at vv.^{30. 34}; 𐤂 קרנותיהן 'their Corinthian capitals,' paralleled by Jos.'s remark that the roof was 'according to Corinthian style,' i.e., he knew Targumic tradition; 𐤂 כרתא, used at vv.^{18f.} for כתפות, 'capitals'; St., Kit., al. correct, after the Gr., to כתפות as struts for support of the roof-beams; Šanda prefers כתר, 'crowns,' as presenting the *finesse* of the art. But 𐤂 (and so 𐤂, 'ligna exciderat'), as at 6³⁶, suffices.—3. עלעה: 'stories,' as at 6⁵; at 6¹⁵ 'beams,' hence Šanda here, 'architraves'.—4. שקפים: cf. 6⁴; Grr. here μελαθρα, vs. the translation there.—אל כחה literally, 'look to look'; Grr., χωρα επι χωραν, as though Aram. קהנא.—5. וכל הפתחים והמונות רבעים שקף ומול כחה אל כחה: the tr. above represents the text, which is authenticated word for word by the Grr., along with wild perversions of reading and rendering. The second noun appears unnecessary; the phrase might be understood as 'the doors with the jambs.' שקף is grammatically obscure; Eissf. ingeniously, 'in Durchblick,' cf. Hif. of the verb. It may be a scribe's gloss to bring in the item of שקפים from v.⁴. Kit., like 𐤂, om. translation. מול, unique as adv., may have been introduced to explain the foll. phrase; or that phrase may be conversely secondary. The Grr. read והמות and (αι χωραι, as above); ומול as וכן; and for 'אל כחה' θυρωματος/θυρας επι θυρας, i.e., as though = 'פה אל פ' פ. The first of these rdgs., with כחות = 'windows' (the assumed noun unique), and the third have been approved by comm., e.g., Burn., St., Eissf.; but such correction would repeat the *vis-à-vis* position of the windows in v.⁴.—6. אולם: Grr., το αιλαμ, and so *infra*; see Note 6³.—7. שלשים: 𐤂 𐤂 'fifty.'—רהבו: Grr. + ἐξυγωμενα, which Klost. and Richter have attempted to explain.—עב: also Eze. 41²⁵; Cooke's suggestion 'cornice,' has been adopted above. Gr. παχος is etymological.—7. . . . עשה: 𐤂 𐤂^L om.—[ער] הקרקע: Jer. Talmud הקירות, as at 6¹⁶, and so here 𐤂; the change, as הקרות, is accepted here by Then., St.,

BH., not by Šanda, *al.* The phrase is technical, EVV correctly, 'from floor to floor' = 'from bottom to top.'—8. חַצְרֵי הַחַיִּיתָה: for the noun, its etymology and gender, see the full discussion by Orłinsky, *AJSL* 1939, 22 ff.; for the article confined to the adj. see GK §126, 5, with sequence by Dr., *Tenses*, §209; similar cases below, v.¹², II. 20⁴ חָר. The Grr. read the adj. as חַצְרֵי הַחַיִּיתָה.—כְּבִיטֵי לְאֵלִים: *n.b.* the compound prep. after Aram. usage; Grr., ἐξελισσομένη (?) τοῦτοις, *i.e.*, = אֵלֵי. — יַעֲשֶׂה: ⑤ ⑥ om.; the gloss from a punctilious scribe, who would date the event where it belonged; *cf.* 9²⁴.—9. וַיִּחַרְץ יוֹ: ⑤ ⑥ om.—הַנֶּשֶׁחַת: the only light on this technical word comes from Gr. γείσαι, 'eaves.'

VV.¹³⁻⁴⁷. The bronze work for the temple. *Cf.* 2 Ch. 2¹³, 3¹⁵⁻⁴ 4¹⁸; *Ant.*, viii, 3, 4-7. The Chronicler makes Hiram master of all the arts, and indirectly at least the artist of the gold and silver vessels. This section, plus vv.⁴⁸⁻⁵¹, is prefixed in OGrr. to vv.¹⁻¹² with the pious purpose of placing the sacred before the profane. Hex. (A x) has it in place; it is missing in the leaves of ⑤^{II}.

13. 14. Introduction of Hiram of Tyre. For the introduction of foreign artists *cf.* the statement by the Hittite king Kuranta of Tarḫuntaš of his fetching an Egyptian artist to build his palace (Winckler, *MVG* 18, 4 (1913), 15; *cf.* Meissner, *Bab. u. Ass.*, I, 228 ff.), and Sennacherib's reference to his 'palace patterned after a Hittite (Syrian) palace' (cited above). For named Egyptian architects, father and son, at Beth-shean see Albright, *From the Stone Age*, 159. The international interest in art is now well illustrated by an Akk. tablet found at Mari on the upper Euphrates, a letter from Hammurabi to Zimrilu, king of that city, stating that the prince of Ugarit desires a description of the palace of Zimrilu and wishes to see it (A. Parrot, *Syria*, 1937, 74). Solomon's great supply of bronze is corroborated by N. Glueck's discoveries and excavations in Edom on the shores of the Red Sea; see the comment at length on Esyon-geber, 9²⁶. The foundry-work is detailed below, v.⁴⁶. For the Egyptian imports of 'Asiatic copper' from the land of Retenu see W. M. Müller, *Asien u. Europa*, 33, 126. Sennacherib reports the making of large bull-colossi of bronze (*ARA* 2, nos. 392, 412 f.). His statement, in the first passage, of enclosing pillars of cedars 'in a sheathing of bronze' is now illustrated by Parrot's report (*ILN*, May 26, 1938, p. 952) of his discovery

at Mari of "two bronze lions . . . actually made of wood, over which a thin bronze leaf had been passed." For ancient bronze work see P. Thomsen, 'Bronzeguss,' *RVg*; for study and illustration of the brass work here described Stade, *GVI* I, 330 ff.; Nowack, *Arch.*, §§76, 77; Benzinger, *Arch.*, §44; also the literature cited above in introduction to the ch., and current references below.

Solomon retains the services of Hiram of Tyre, a worker in bronze, son of a widow of the tribe of Naphtali, and his father a man of Tyre. . . . He came . . . and did all his (Solomon's) work. His manifold talents are expressed in the words generally translated as *wisdom, understanding, knowledge*; similar words are used for the endowment of the Messiah in Is. 11²; they might be translated here with *artistry, intelligence, skill*.

15-22. The two bronze pillars. For the text, along with the abbreviated parallel, 2 Ch. 3¹⁵⁻¹⁷, we have the recapitulation of the brass work, Jer. 52¹⁸⁻²³, which again is briefly summarized in II. 25¹⁶⁻¹⁷, with another varying summary below, vv. 41, 42. For criticism of the text see Thenius, Stade (remarking, *Akad. Reden*, 162, that the whole section on the brass work "gehört zu den am schlimmsten überlieferten des a.t. Textes"), Šanda. In the following presentation of the text bracketed portions are secondary. Footnote references immediately follow.

15. And he ¹cast¹ the two pillars (of) bronze² 18 cubits the height of the one pillar, with a tape of 12 cubits ¹encircling it, and its thickness (of the bronze) 4 fingers, hollow³; 16. and two capitals [he made]⁴ to put upon the top of the pillars, cast in bronze; 5 cubits the height of the one capital, and 5 cubits the height of the second capital; 17. checker-works⁵ [checker-make, festoons, chain-work]⁶ ¹for the capitals⁷ ⁷on top of the pillars,

Jer. ch. 52. 21. And the pillars 18¹³ cubits the height of the one pillar, with a tape of 12 cubits encircling it, and its thickness 4 fingers, hollow; 22. and a capital upon it, bronze, and the height of the one capital 5¹⁴ cubits;

'a checker-work' [H seven]⁸
 for the one capital, and a
 checker-work [H seven] for the
 second capital; 18. [and he
 made the pillars]⁹ and two
 rows 'of pomegranates of
 bronze'¹⁰ round about upon
 the one checker-work [to cover
 the capitals on top of the pome-
 granates]¹¹; and so [he
 made]⁴ for the second capital;
 20b.; and the pomegranates
 200 in rows round about upon
 'the one' [H second]¹² pillar.

and pomegranates upon the
 capital round about, the whole
 bronze; and like this for the
 second pillar; [and pome-
 granates]¹⁵. 23. and the pome-
 granates were 96, 'pendant',¹⁶
 all the pomegranates 100, upon
 the checker-work round about.

¹ ויצר: corrected by St., BH, al. to ויצק (cf. v.46); but see Comm., II. 12¹¹ for use of the verb in sense of 'minting.' ² Grr. + τω αλαμ του οικου (B a₂ το το τω), a gloss from v.21; see SBOT. ³ The text of Jer. accepted: טובב אצבעות ארבע ועביו יסבנו = 6 6L. ⁴ Otiose in this originally verbless list, and so in v.18. ⁵ Grr., 'and he made two checker-works.' ⁶ Grr. om. this supernumerary passage, except for Lucian's plus at end of the v., μεγαλα, i.e., rdg. גדלים. For the chain-work see 2 Ch. 3¹⁶. ⁷ 'For the capitals' is emended by the Grr., for the sake of precision to 'to cover the capitals,' as in the insertion in v.18; the addition is generally accepted. ⁸ Read שָׁפָקָה with Grr.; cf. Jer., vs. שִׁבְעָה. ⁹ Grr. om. the superfluous statement; on basis of two Heb. MSS some critics (e.g., Burn., St., BH) would read הרבנים for העמודים. ¹⁰ For נודים Grr. a plus = נתשה רבני תשה (cf. v.42), which gives the expected detail. ¹¹ Grr. om.; variant duplicate of v.17; for הרבנים read העמודים, with some 50 MSS Ken., deR. = 5 A. ¹² For השניה is read האחה with St.; Benz., Burn. propose a lacuna to be filled out from v.17; or possibly there was originally no numeral. ¹³ '18 (cubits)': 2 Ch. 3¹⁵, '35.' ¹⁴ '5 (cubits)': II. 25¹⁷, '3.' ¹⁵ ורמנים: an evident doublet; II. 25¹⁷, על השבכה. ¹⁶ רוחה: the unique adv. of direction has been variously understood, but 9, 'pendentibus,' 'hanging' (cf. German 'luftwärts') gives the mng. (see Cornill, ad loc., citing Rashi); four of the nodules of the loop were attached to the column, the remainder hanging free. Jer.'s figure '100' refers to the single loop.

19. 20a. 22. These sections are additions to the presenta-
 tion above, with some fresh items, but repetitive, along with
 a unique Hebrew word. OGrr rearranged in the order vv.²¹-
 19. 20a, omitting vv.^{20b}. 22 (MS v has v.^{22b}). 19. And capitals
 that were on top of the two pillars, lily-work, in the portico,
 4 cubits. 20a. And capitals upon the two pillars, even above,
 6*

close to the globe-top [Heb. belly] that was opposite to the checker-work. 22. And upon top of the pillars lily-work. And the business of the pillars was finished.

Authentic items are given with the lily-work, four cubits (high), and the technical word belly, doubtless identical with the word translated bowl, vv. 41. 42. In the portico, v. 19, may be gloss from v. 21. The word translated close to (v. 20) is a novel preposition; the Grr. read or guessed at the impossible 'chambers' (cf. 6⁵). V. 22^b was suggested by v. 40^b.

41. 42. This summary account from below is presented here for convenience of comparison. 41. Two pillars, and the bowls of the capitals that were on top of the pillars, two, and the checker-works, two, to cover the two bowls of the capitals that were on top of the pillars; 42. and the pomegranates, 400, for the two checker-works, two rows of pomegranates to the one checker-work, to cover the two bowls of the capitals that were upon the pillars.

For the last prep. 'upon,' על בני י, על שני = י; 11 MSS על ראש (cf. v. 41) = ש י. The passage presents a fresh technical term, כלי, 'bowls,' used evidently for a structure of bowl shape, and corresponding to Heb. 'belly,' v. 20. Also the figure for the whole sum of pomegranates is given.

21. And he erected the pillars for the portico of the hall; and he erected the right-hand pillar, and called its name Jachin; and he erected the left-hand pillar, and called its name Boaz. For v. 22 see above.

For the name Yākin, 'he (deity not named) establishes' see Albright, *JBL* 1924, 375, with the more pregnant translation, 'he creates.' For the verbal element cf. the later royal name Yehoiakin, and it is frequent in Phœn. names, compounded with a divine subject (Harris, *Gram.*, 110—citing also a *n. pr.*, *ykn.*). Cf. the S. Arab. name of a gate at Obne, *ykn*, 'it (he?) stands (is?)', Ryckmans, *NPS* 1, 344. For the second name as Ba'al-'az, 'Baal is strong,' the writer refers to his Note in *JQR* 25 (1935), 265. Ugaritic *b'l 'z* appears in a thrice-repeated acclamation, 'Baal is strong!', in Virolleaud's first long text (*Syria*, 12, 220, col. vi, lines 17-20 = *MTRS* 56; C. H. Gordon, *Ugar. Hdbk.*, 2, Text 49: vi: 17-20). Also, as has not been otherwise observed, there was a true Gr. tradition of this etymology; MS h (55) here has Βοολαζ, in which the oo represents a Palm. vocalization (Lidzb., *HNE* 234); for other diminutives of the divine name with loss of the l in Phœn., see *ib.*, p. 239, and Harris, p. 24. But nearer home

is the name of Solomon's ancestor, Bo'az=Ba'al-'az. For the most recent discussion with review of the many various interpretations see R. B. Y. Scott, 'The Pillars Jachin and Boaz,' *JBL* 1939, 143 ff. But he finds in the name a kind of cryptogram for "In the strength of YHWH shall the king rejoice"; and with this Albright agrees, *SAC* 139. However, in Solomon's day 'Baal' was not a taboo word, and in any case the Phœnician artist had the right to name his own creations. There are to be added supplementarily to the literature the full archæological treatment of the subject by Albright in his art., 'Two Cressets from Marisa and the Pillars of Jachin and Boaz,' *BASOR* 85 (1942), 18 ff., and the article by H. G. May, 'The Two Pillars before the Temple of Solomon,' *ib.* no. 88, 19 ff.

Apart from the indifferent testimony of Ch. we thus have three notices of the pillars, each contributing independent information. The single pillar was 18 cubits high, with a circumference of 5 cubits, and so with diameter of 1.58 cubits. It possessed a capital 5 cubits high, which bellied, rounded out (to use the Hebrew terms), forming a bowl-shaped top, and was covered with a checker-work pattern, along with an ornamentation of leaves of the lily (*i.e.*, a species like the iris, flag, etc.), the long, narrow leaves being given a height of 4 cubits. From the capital were suspended two strings of technical pomegranates, each string being strung with a hundred of them, four being attached at the several quarters, leaving ninety-six in suspension. The lily-work (similar to the use of the lotus in Egyptian architecture) for capitals is illustrated in a coin of Byblos with superimposed series of lily-like leaves, the capital itself being one quarter the height of the whole length of the pillar (*ca.* A.D. 218, in the British Museum, and figured in Perrot and Chipiez, *Histoire de l'art*, 3, cut 67; Gressmann, *ATB* 2, cut 522); *cf.* also the small clay 'dove-house,' from Cyprus, representing a temple with two robust pillars at the entrance, surmounted with large capitals (Perrot and Chipiez, cut 58; *cf.* Gressman, cut 523; Benzinger, *Arch.*, cut 424); in these cases they stand independent, like Jachin and Boaz. *Cf.* also the Hadhrumetum stone, presenting two pillars surmounted with female busts (Pietschmann, *Gesch. d. Phön.*, 219). A common type of Sidonian coinage presents the front of a temple with a tall independent pillar on either side. Also, according to Herodotus, ii, 44, the temple of Heracles at Tyre had "in it two pillars, one or

refined gold [cf. the term at 6²¹], one of emerald." Lucian reports (*De Dea Syra*, 28) *phalli* at the entrance of the goddess's temple, '30 fathoms high' (!). The origin of such an architectural feature may be found in the primitive *maššēbôt*, pairs of which have been found at Ta'anach and Megiddo.¹ The relation of the lily-leaves to the capital has been a problem. Benzinger presents a design (Comm., p. 44, reproduced in Eissfeldt's Comm.) with the leaves surmounting the bowl, in which case the total height would be $18+5+4=27$ cubits. But as one description speaks only of the capital with the lily-work, while the other identifies the capital with the flowers, it is rather evident that the bowl was nested in the foliate adornment, the latter projecting upwards about the bowl for 4 cubits, with the globe, 5 cubits high, appearing through the interstices of the leaves and above; so Stade, *GVI* 1, 332, reproduced in Kittel's Comm.—although in disagreement with the design—and in Barton, *AB* fig. 247. The pendant loops are a unique item to archæological knowledge. For the extensive development of brass work in small figures, tools, and the like, see Contenau, *La civilization phénicienne*, 209 f. Finally a note of admiration must be struck for these several technical specifications, the earliest of the kind in history, and based upon exact knowledge, e.g., the thickness of the bronze in the hollow pillars. The same quality distinguishes the subordinate two sets of specifications.

23-26. The bronze sea. **23.** *And he made the sea, cast work, 10 cubits (across) from brim to brim, all round about (i.e., circular), and 5 cubits its height, with a measuring-line of 30 cubits encircling it about; 24. and gourds under its brim about, encircling it [10 cubits encircling the sea about—an intrusion from v.²³]; two rows the gourds, cast with its casting; 26. and its thickness a hand's breadth; and its brim like the work of the rim of a cup, a lily flower (i.e., a lily-shaped brim); holding 2000 baths; 25. standing upon twelve oxen, three facing north, and three facing west, and three facing south, and three facing east, with the sea upon them above, and all their hinder parts inwards.*

¹ E.g., Benzinger, cut 413. See for further examples Cook, *Rel. of Anc. Pal.*, 166 ff., and the extensive documentation in Scott's study. J. P. Peters suggested the existence of such a pair of pillars at Nippur (*Nippur*, 1897, 2, 47).

The transposition of vv.^{25. 26} follows the OGrr. and the general judgment of modern scholars, and is required for syntactical construction. But v.²⁶ gives an independent specification of the brim, inserted as a colophon. The description is clear and picturesque. In the matter of circumference to diameter, given as 3.0, the Grr. change the figures to $33 \div 10 = 3.3$, obtaining a value farther from actual 3.1416.¹ The capacity of the sea is given at 2000 baths. The bath has been variously estimated: by Nowack, Benzinger at 36.44 litres, with the total for the sea = 72,880 litres. This figure has now been greatly increased by C. H. Inge, in *PEQ* 1941, 106 ff.; among three ancient jars from Lachish, one, too fragmentary for reconstruction, was marked with *bt lmlk*, 'a bath of the king'; another, with a private seal; a third, with *lmlk*, 'the king's,' *i.e.*, standard measure. Concerning the latter two, he holds that the former would have held some 46 litres, the latter 45. For the subject at large are to be noted the discussions by Nowack (*Arch.*, 1, 206) and Šanda, who hold that too little is known of the form of the vessel to estimate its capacity.² The Chronicler, as often, expands the figure to 3000 baths, followed by Josephus. The purpose of this great reservoir was primarily for ablutions, and so Ch. adds the note that "the sea was for the priests to wash in." There was the Rabbinic rule for bare feet in the temple courts, which would have required their washing (Dalman, *A. u. S.*, 5, 152, 296). The sea was doubtless the source of supply for the lavers described below. Artificial pools of water were constant in ancient temples, and with like technical name as here. 'Seas' were built in Babylonian temples (Jeremias, *ATLAO* 494 f., *cf.* Šanda, and Albright, *JAOs* 1920, 316 f.). Close to the temple of the Dea Syra was a great sacred lake (Lucian, §45). And such basins,

¹ T. Dantzig, in his *Numbers, the Language of Science* (1930), 113, comments on the Hebrew proportion here as "5% short of the actual. The Egyptians made a closer estimate; we find in the papyrus Rhind (1700 B.C.) the value of π as equal to $3\frac{1}{8}$. . . which is only $\frac{1}{8}$ of 1% in excess." But the figuration here in either Hebrew or Greek was a round figure.

² Mostly recently Albright, arguing from the same jars, contradicts the large figures of Inge and others, reducing the size of the bath to 22 litres (*ASOR* 21-2 [1943], 58, n. 7).

supplied with running water, at the entrance of temples are vouched for in S. Arab. inscriptions ; for a case see N. Rhodokanakis, *Sb.*, Vienna Academy, no. 177, pt. 2 (1915), 7. The source of water-supply for this reservoir is not stated ; Šanda is inclined to think that there already existed the conduit from the so-called Solomon's Pools ; but see Smith, *Jerusalem*, 1, ch. 5. The sea must have been filled by windlasses or otherwise from the underground cisterns, for which see Smith, *op. cit.*, 119 ff. Nowack (*Arch.*, 2, 44) cites Kusters, who notes the elimination of the sea in Eze., in which apocalypse it is replaced on its site by the spring of the temple (Eze. 47^{1ff.}). This great bronze laver was, as far as we know, indeed a unique masterpiece, with the artistry of the lily-like brim, decorated below with rows of gourds (*cf.* 6¹⁸), all of one casting, and resting on twelve bulls of the same metal. For the essay at reproducing this work of art see Stade, *GVI* 1, 336, whose plan is repeated in the BDD, Commentaries and Archæologies in general. But a criticism is to be made of this now conventional design, which presents the great bowl as wholly supported upon the backs of the oxen—an extraordinary load for such figures. Rather the oxen were pediment figures, with their 'hinder parts' suppressed under the curve of the bowl, which latter rested on the ground. And such an artistic feature appears in von Oppenheim's plate 47, in his *Tell Halaf*, presenting the socket for an image with six lions underneath in like fashion.

23. יָם : *cf.* S. Arab. *mbhr* used of a pool (Conti Rossini, *Chrest.*, 112), and in the same region of South Arabia a reservoir is called a 'sea,' acc. to D. Van der Meulen and H. von Wissmann, *Hadramaut and Some of its Mysteries Unveiled* (Leiden, 1932), 94.—מִיָּם : 𐤎 𐤍 𐤌 om. ; Hex. χυτην (A αυτην).—מִיָּבֵי : B a₂ 𐤌 om.—קוּה ; 𐤎𐤓. 𐤓 : the Kt. also appears elsewhere ; the word is synonymous with חוּם, v.¹⁵.—24. בִּיעָקוּי . . . שְׁנֵי : B a₂ om.—25. הַיָּם עֲלֵיהֶם מְלֻמְעֵלָה : Gr., exc. A x, transfer to end of v.—בֵּיתָה : 𐤎 𐤇 𐤍 𐤓. 𐤀𐤎𐤏𐤐, 𐤎 correctly, 𐤀𐤓 𐤓𐤀 𐤀𐤓𐤏𐤐.

27-39. The wheeled stands and their lavers ; their location along with that of the sea. Ch. om., except for summary *in re* the lavers, and note of their use by the priests to wash in, along with statement as to position of the sea. Josephus has an elaborate varying description, probably prompted by

his knowledge of similar vessels, *Ant.*, viii, 3, 6. For extensive studies see Klostermann, *Stade* (*ZAW* 3, 159 ff. = *Akad. Reden*, 166 ff.), Burney (with careful study of the text and language), Stade and Haupt in *SBOT*, Kittel in his *Studien*, pp. 189-242 (the most extensive of all the discussions). For reconstructions, and reproductions of the Cypriote vessels to be mentioned below, see Stade, *GVI* 1, 340 f.; Burney, Kittel; Nowack, *Arch.*, 2, 43 f.; Gressmann, *ATB* vol. 1, pls. cciii, cciv; Benzinger, *Arch.*, 44 f.; Barton, *AB* pl. 87; also BDD, Commentaries.

For such wheeled vessels in temple use may be noted the low-lying bronze wagon found by von Oppenheim (*Tell Halaf*, 190, and pl. 58b); also incense wagons have been discovered at Tell-Khafāje in Babylonia, for which see Frankfort in *ILN*, June 8, 1934, pp. 910 ff. But it is two archaic vessels from Cyprus that particularly illustrate the creations of the Phœnician artist Hiram, both of bronze, the one from Enkome, with the wheels now lost, the other a rather well-preserved miniature vessel found in a grave at Larnaka. For primary publication of these relics see A. S. Murray, *Journal of Royal Inst. of British Architects*, 1899, pp. 20 ff. (cited by Burney), and at length, with comparison of the Solomonic objects, A. Furtwängler, in *Sb.* of the Munich Academy, vol. 2, pt. 2 (1899). Watzinger rightly remarks, in an excellent summary of the subject (*DP* 1, 104 f.): "Every attempt at reconstruction of the stands of the temple will have to start from the agreement of the construction with the Cypriote kettle-wagons. . . . It is accordingly evident that the kettle-wagons and the stands must have come from neighbouring workshops."

Also pertinent to our subject is the account that Pausanias gives (x, 16, 2) of an iron stand and bowl, the honorific gift to a temple from the Lydian king Alyattes (first half of the 6th cent. B.C.). The passage is commented upon at length by G. Karo, 'Das Weihgeschenk des Alyattes,' in *ARw.*, Beiheft to vol. 8 (1905), 54-65; and this item has been enlarged upon by Kittel, *Studien*, 189 ff. Because of its interest the translation by W. M. S. Jones in the *Loeb Library* is herewith given. "Of the offerings sent by the Lydian kings I found nothing remaining except the iron stand of the bowl of Alyattes. This is the work of Glaukos the Chian, the

man who discovered how to weld iron. Each plate of the stand is fastened to another, not by bolts or rivets, but by the welding, which is the only thing that fastens and holds together the iron. The shape of the stand is very like that of a tower, wider at the bottom and rising to a narrow top. Each side of the stand is not solid throughout, but the iron cross-strips are placed like the rungs of a ladder. The upright iron plates are turned outwards at the top, so forming a seat for the bowl." We have here the stand with crown at the top to hold the bowl as in our text, the open work and welding as here, and the cross-pieces 'like the rungs of a ladder' exactly defining an obscure work of our text.

27. *And he made the stands, ten, of bronze; 4 cubits the length of the one stand, and 4 cubits its width, and 3 cubits its height; 28. and this the make of the stand: frame-pieces to them [so **U**—error for it], and frame-pieces between the cross-pieces; 29. and upon the frame-pieces between the cross-pieces lions, cattle, and cherubs, and so upon the cross-pieces; 'and' [plus with Grr.] above and [with correction of Heb. punctuation] below the lions and the cattle spirals, hammered work; 30. and four wheels of bronze to the one stand, and axles of bronze; and its four feet, with shoulder-pieces under the laver, the shoulder-pieces welded . . . [?] spirals; 31. and its mouth within the crown and above at a cubit (high), and its mouth rounded, the make of a container, $1\frac{1}{2}$ cubits (high); and further upon its mouth gravings; 'and their [so **U**]; cf. v.²⁸] frame-pieces squared, not rounded' [an addition, out of place].*

32. *and the quartette of wheels underneath the frame-pieces, and the axles [Heb. hands] of the wheels in the stand; and the height of the one wheel $1\frac{1}{2}$ cubits; 33. and the work of the wheels like the work of a chariot wheel, their axles and felloes and spokes and hubs welded (i.e., as one piece); 34. and four shoulder-pieces at the four corners of the one stand, its shoulder-pieces part of the stand; 35. and at the top of the stand [a lacuna here—cf. v.³¹] $1\frac{1}{2}$ cubits in height, round about; and at the top of the stand its handles [? Heb. hands] and its frame-pieces, (being) part of it. 36. And he engraved upon the panels*

[~~It~~+its handles] and upon its frame-pieces cherubs, lions and palms . . . [?—cf. v.³⁰] and spirals round about.

37. Like this he made the ten stands, cast in one piece, one measure, one form for them all. 38. And he made ten lavers of bronze, (each) holding [Heb. verb in sing.] 40 baths, 4 cubits (high) the one laver; one laver upon the one stand for the ten stands. 39. And he placed the stands, five at the corner of the house at the right (=south), and five at the corner of the house at its left (=north), and the sea 'he placed' [secondary] at the right-hand corner of the house to the southeast.

The above presentation of the text regards vv.³²⁻³⁶, offset to the right, as secondary *vs.* Stade, who so considers vv.^{28-31b}, but in agreement with Kittel. The former assumes vv.^{34, 35} to be secondary as parallel to vv.^{29, 31}, but retains v.³⁶ as primary; yet we have here a parallel to v.²⁹, disagreeing with it only in the terms of the panels and the pictured figures, which latter point he would overcome by artful distribution of the decorations presented in his plate. Šanda, following his critical method for the text of the description of the temple (ch. 6), obtains harmony by rearrangement of the vv. in this sequence: vv.^{27, 28, 29, 36, 31, 30, 32, 33}, with vv.^{31, 35} inset as a parallel to v.³⁰; but such chaotic disarrangements are most improbable in text-transmission.

The writer's results, in large part independent, are as follows: the *frame-pieces* 1^o in v.²⁸ are the upright corner-pieces; *frame-pieces* 2^o are additional uprights on the face of the stand, and so *between the cross-pieces*, a phrase otherwise insoluble; the *cross-pieces* are horizontal, and they are panelled (the noun translated *panel* is also used of a writing-tablet, even as here the panel is engraved), and so the frame-pieces and cross-pieces of v.²⁸ correspond to the frame-pieces and panels of v.³⁶; *the crown*, v.³¹, is retained, as *vs.* the common correction to *shoulder-pieces*, producing confusion with the inferior *shoulder-pieces* of v.³⁰, while just such a circular crown is represented in the Larnaka kettle (see Note). This brass work was evidently open, not full-plated all about, as some reproductions present the object, for the water was contained in the inset laver. The whole account, apart from some interpolations, is derived from reports of interested and

technically trained eye-witnesses; while their testimony is confusing, as here presented, we have evidence of unique interest in a work of high art.

There remains the difficult problem of the practical use of these vessels. This has been considered by Kittel uniquely and at length, pp. 236-42. His argument is as follows: the 40 baths at 36.4 litres=1456 litres=384 gallons, and in weight, 1400 kilograms=3086 lb.; adding to this at a hazard the assumed weight of laver and stand he obtains for the loaded truck 3400 kg.=7495 lb.=3 $\frac{3}{4}$ short tons. The mobility of an ancient truck under such a load is inconceivable. In Kittel's view also the practicability of the vessel is spoiled by its height, which at its lowest terms, according to his calculation, is 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ cubits=8 ft. 3 in.; how then was the water filled in and drawn out? The primitive cup-pump may have been used for filling the vessel; cf. Comm. on the bronze sea above. For drawing the water may the siphon have been used so early? Kittel's consequent deduction is that these vessels were purely 'symbols of the water-dispensing Deity,' even as he earlier interpreted the bronze sea. While his practical argument cannot be gainsaid, the abundance of such massive and useless ritual vessels would seem quite *de trop*. The bronze sea might have been symbolical, but these lavers appear practical for the distribution of water—most necessary indeed in connexion with the bloody rites of the temple.¹

39. From the position of the bronze sea at the south-eastern point of the temple arose Ezekiel's eschatological expectation of the stream issuing and trickling at the south side of the eastern portal of the temple (47^{1ff.}).

¹ As for the term *laver* (*hîyôr*), used of cooking pots (1 Sam. 2¹⁴) and actual priestly lavers (Ex. 30^{18ff.}, etc.), this must have been a vessel of bowl shape. For the Sumerian origin of the word see Albr., *JAO* 36 (1916), 232. The laver on top of the stand projected one cubit above the latter and thus formed with it a perfect cube with a capacity of 64 cubic cubits; the laver, however, contained only a quarter of this amount, which is the equivalent of some 1525 litres. This fits well with the 40 baths (1456 litres) of v. 38. If, however, the laver occupied the whole interior of the stand and projected one cubit above it, we have to assume that it was not filled, but that only 40 baths of water were poured into it. Supplementary reference is to be made to n. 2 of Comm., vv. 23-26, for Albright's diminution of the bath to about two-thirds of the currently accepted figures.

27. סננות : 'stands,' so by proper etymology Chic. B. (Moff., 'trolleys'!); EVV 'bases' = פ 'bases' = ט בסיסא ; ש 'aggānē' 'basins' = א. Grr. transliterate with μεχωνωθ, indifferently for sing. and pl. Hommel's opinion (*EGAO* 144) that the Heb. word occurs with the same mng. in S. Arab. is not to be accepted; see Conti Rossini, *Chrest.*, 168.—The dimensions, 4×4×3 are altered by Grr. to 5×4×6; the last figure may be explained as due to the addition of the figures for wheels and top-piece, v.³¹; cf. the purposed change of figure at v.²³.—28. שִׁבְרֵי, סגרת : the first word translated above as (upright) *frame-pieces*; Grr., συγκλειστον, 'rim' (?), and so prob. ט ש ; פ for 1⁰ 'interrasile' ('low-relief-work'), but for 2⁰ 'sculpturæ.' The word is used technically for the rim of the show-bread table (Ex. 25²⁵, etc.). This mng. is generally accepted (e.g., by St., Burn., Kit., Šanda), with application of the word to the horizontal base and top border of the square vessel. The word occurs also in a gloss, II. 16¹⁷. The second technical term, translated here with *cross-pieces*, has corresponding Pu. ppl., used of boards mortised together (Ex. 26¹⁷, 36²²); our noun prob. occurs in the Phœn. Marseilles Tariff (*CIS* I, no. 165=Cooke, *NSI* no. 42) in sense of 'ribs' of sacrificial animals, and so with query Cooke and Harris (*Gram.*, 150). ט tr. with the cognate שִׁבְרֵי, 'rung' of a ladder, 'ledge'; cf. פ 'iuncturas.' The word then corresponds exactly to the 'cross-strips' of Pausanias's description, cited above. (The uncertainty of interpretation of the two words is displayed in EVV: AV 'borders' and 'ledges,' RVV 'panels' and 'ledges,' JV 'borders' and 'stays.') As this feature is then etymologically a horizontal cross-piece ('rib'), the *misgērôt* must logically be, in the first place, the upright corner-pieces of the vessel; and such is Jos.'s interpretation, 'four tetragonal small pillars (κλινοσκοι), standing at each corner.' But interpreters have generally reversed the mng. of the terms, making the 'ribs' stand upright, and the *msgrt* the top and bottom. V.^b accordingly becomes a crux; some would change the text, e.g., Klost., Burn., Šanda, while Kit. and St. (with change of mind in *SBOT*) hesitate at alteration. The relation denoted by the *frame-pieces between the cross-pieces* has appeared most obscure; see Kit., pp. 208 ff. But with the new designation of the first item we may understand reference to intermediate vertical pieces between the horizontal bars. The stand was open within this frame of upright- and cross-pieces.—להם: easily corrected by critics to לה, or to להן; but below there are several grammatical errors, prob. original.—29. אריות: for the lion-motif cf. 10^{19f}. Jos. gives lion, bull, eagle, and subsequently makes the laver rest on the paws of lion and eagle.—בקר: Grr.=ובקר.—בן סמגל: read בן (with athnah) ובסגל, with Grr., St., al.—ליח מעשה מורד: Grr. χωραι (?) ερκεσ καταβασεως; ט שרוב עובר כנוש, 'attachment of welding-work'; פ 'quasi lora ex aere dependentia'; ש is free; AV 'certain additions made of thin work,' cf. ט; RVV JV 'wreaths of hanging

work,' which presents the current interpretation for the first word as to be connected with לִיָּה, 'crown,' Pr. 1⁹ (so Keil), and hence Kit. argues (pp. 221 f.) for correction to the pl. of the latter word, לִיָּיִת; similar renderings, 'garlands,' 'rosettes,' have been suggested. But Kit. in postscript (p. 235) pertinently calls attention to 'das beliebte Strickornament' on the Enkomi vessel, *i.e.*, the series of connected spiral rings. In *AJA* 43 (1939), are plates illustrating a variety of such spiraliform motives of different origins and ages: C. W. Blegen's article on Post-Mycenæan art, figs. 6, 16 (pp. 416, 429), and Glueck's presentation of a Nabatæan temple, figs. 3, 4 (p. 382). The other obscure word, מָוֹר, is interpreted by \mathfrak{P} as from מִוֵּר, and so Kamp., Burn. render with 'stepped/bevelled work.' Kit., followed by Šanda, offers the best solution with derivation from מִוֵּר, 'to hammer in, inlay,' even as the Hif. was used above, 6³².—30. מַעֲבָרָי: another case of careless grammar; the fem. suff. is expected.—The passage וּמַעֲלָה וְהַחֲתָמָה, v. 31, fails in $\mathfrak{C} \mathfrak{C}^L$, is supplied by A x.—|| מַעֲבָר אִישׁ לִיָּה: to the equally obscure וּמַעֲבָר אִישׁ וְלִיָּה סָבִיב, end of v. 36. \mathfrak{T} is arbitrarily different, reading the first word as מַעֲבָר = \mathfrak{S} ; Hex. (A x), *απο περιαν αυδρος προσκειμεναι*: \mathfrak{P} 'contra se invicem respectantes'; RVV JV attempt a plausible interpretation, 'with wreaths at the side of each,' and similarly Burn. But Kit., St. (*SBOT*), Šanda despair of interpretation. Early comm., cited by Poole, followed a novelty of Jewish exegesis, which is presented by Kit. (p. 224) from *Yoma* 55a: "the cherubs who are attached to each other are a symbol of God's love, like the love of man and wife"; and similarly Rashi tr. here with "associations (לִיָּה) of man and wife pictured," this interpretation arising from the obscure מַעֲבָר, v. 36, which he derives from the root עָרָה, used of sexual connexion, and so he baldly expounds v. 36. AV tr. מַעֲבָר with 'according to the proportion (RVV JV space) of each,' with marginal note to the noun, 'Heb. nakedness,' faithfully following old Jewish exegesis. The whole phrase with its item of the decorative spirals is in place below, not here.—31. וְפִיָּה: the suffix has been carelessly attracted to preceding בֵּינִי; correct to וְפִיָּה as immediately below, the reference being to the stand.—מְבִיָּה לְחֹרֶת: the noun occurs at v. 16 in architectural sense of 'capital,' which does not suit here; here it = מְבָר, 'crown,' Est. 1¹¹, and refers to the round top. Correction to מְבָרָה, 'shoulder-pieces,' has been generally adopted since Ewald's suggestion, but this term is associated with the feet of the stand, vv. 30, 34, while here we are engaged with the top. Šanda appropriately calls attention to the Larnaka kettle, in which the square tray at top is surmounted with a cylinder. In similar fashion, the laver was to be inserted in this *crown*. This circular top-piece projected above the stand proper by *a cubit*; but just below the height is given as *a cubit and a half*, for which augment *cf.* the extra *half-cubit* of v. 35. The extra figure may refer to the projection of the laver above the holder.

Or there may be noted the (artificial?) summation of cubits: $1 + 1\frac{1}{2}$ (v.³¹) + $1\frac{1}{2}$ (v.³⁵) = 4 (v.³⁸).—כֵּן כֵּן סֵעֵשָׁה כֵּן— appears as the container, standard of a laver in Ex. 30¹⁸, 31⁹, etc.—מִקְלָעוֹת: also above, 6¹⁸, etc.—וּכְסוּתֵיהֶם: the fem. sing. suff. is demanded as referring to the stand, v.²⁷; cf. the similar distant reference of פִּיּוּ, v.³¹.—32. The v. expands v.³⁰.—יָרוֹת: 'axle-trees,' so the generally received tr., following \mathfrak{P} , 'axes,' v.³³.—33. בְּנֵיהֶם: for the 'felloe,' or 'rim,' and its prominent part in a chariot wheel cf. Eze. 1^{18f}, and see Cooke, *ad loc.*—חֲשָׁקֵיהֶם הַשְּׂרִייהֶם: for the two unique words see Lexx. \mathfrak{G} \mathfrak{L} om. (by honest ignorance?); A e f w present one of the two items with $\alpha\chi\chi\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\varsigma$, and so x with a further plus, $\omega\mu\alpha\iota$.—34. אֵל, Or. עַל: Grr., $\epsilon\pi\iota$; cf. the extensive irregular use of אֵל, e.g., 6¹⁸, 8³⁰.—35a. The v. is parallel to v.³¹. A subject is expected, hence כֵּן is inserted by St. (or כֵּה), Šanda, BH ('fortasse'); but the phrase is another case of broken grammar, and hence the absolute קוֹמָה, corrected generally by critics to קוֹמָתוֹ with Grr.—35b. The passage is quite unintelligible. וְעַל רֹאשׁ הַמִּבְנָה is apparently a duplicate of the phrase in v.^a; Kit. (cf. BH) would add 'and underneath the stand,' an arbitrary addition without fresh light. יָרוֹת was used in connexion with the wheels, v.³², but cannot have that mng. here; it might mean the handles at top in which the frame-pieces terminated, and as represented in Kit.'s plate, p. 237, Gressmann, fig. 508. The word is also glossed into v.³⁶.—36. הַלְלוּ: B e₂ pref. $\tau\epsilon\sigma\sigma\alpha\rho\alpha\varsigma$, error for $\tau\alpha\varsigma$. The pairing of this item with the frame-pieces is parallel to the pairing of the cross-pieces with the frame-pieces, vv.^{28f}, and proves the identity of the panels with the cross-pieces. The word is used of a writing tablet, Is. 30⁸.—יָרוֹת: a gloss, as noted above, and so St., Kit., who also so adjudge the foll. phrase.—וְעַל וּכְסוּתֵיהֶם: MSS, \aleph r. correctly וְעַל אֵשׁ וְלֵיטָה.—וְעַל כֵּסֵף: Grr., \mathfrak{T} are fairly unintelligible; \mathfrak{S} \mathfrak{A} om.; \mathfrak{P} a long paraphrase, "quasi in similitudinem hominis stantis, ut non celata, sed apposita, per circuitum viderentur"; cf. Jos., "that those who viewed them would think that they were one piece."—37. קָצַב אֹהֶר: =6²⁵; Grr. om., exc. A.—לְלִבְנָה: for similar odd forms see GK §91, f, BL §98, p.—39. The final term of location of the sea=south-east, makes the former terms 'right'=south, and 'left'=north.—נָתַן: \mathfrak{G} om.; an intrusion from Ch.

40-47. Summary of Hiram's work, mostly secondary in origin. || 2 Ch. 4¹¹⁻¹⁸, and cf. II. 25^{13ff.}. This is prefaced with an item repeated from v.^{45a}, and secondary here (so with Šanda, vs. Stade). 40. And Hiram made the pots (with v.⁴⁵; \mathfrak{H} lavers, by careless slip; see Note) and the shovels and the sprinkling-vessels. The last object was for applying the sacrificial blood (e.g., Lev. 7¹⁴). The three terms are repeated from Ex. 27³, "its pots to take away its ashes, its shovels

and sprinkling-vessels." 41. 42. These vv. concerning the pillars have been presented above, Comm. 7¹³⁻²². 45. The vessels are declared to have been of polished bronze. 46. The v. contains the one original and novel statement in the section : *In the circuit of the Jordan did he* [with OGr., *Ἡ* the king] *cast them, in the clay ground between Succoth and Sarethan.* So practically EVV, following the ancient VSS. The original of 'in the clay ground,' *bm'bh h'dmh*, has been a major object of dispute. It has been characterized by Moore (Comm., Jud. 7²²), seconded by Stade, as meaningless here, followed by Comm. generally, and so by Abel, *GP* 2, 238; they read with slight change of the Heb., *bm'brt 'dmh*, 'at the ford of Adamah,' which then is identified with Adam, 'the city beside Sarethan,' at the ford by which the Israelites crossed the Jordan (Josh. 3¹⁶).¹ But Albright holds that the preposition in such a phrase, 'in the ford,' makes this change impossible. He accordingly reads 'in the foundries of Adamah' (*JPOS* 1925, 33). But the objection to this location is that it cannot be said to lie 'between Succoth and Sarethan,' on any identification of these places. Most recently Glueck, in an extensive article, 'Three Israelite Towns in the Jordan Valley, Zarethan, Succoth, Zaphon,' *BASOR* 90 (1943), 2-23, has returned to the non-geographical interpretation of the passage, following Albright, in one word, 'in the earthen foundries' (pp. 13 f.). The noun in this rendering (actually singular in the Heb. = 'foundry-work') means moulds of clay for casting of the bronze. Reference is to be made to Glueck's study also for his identification of Succoth as Deir-'Allā (following Albright, *AASOR* 6 [1926], 46 f.), with Sarethan in question; for the latter cf. Abel, *GP* 450 f. Note is to be made of the ancient culture now discovered at Transjordanic Tuleilat el-Ghassūl, E. of Jericho, where early bronze axes have been discovered; see Mallon, Koepfel, Neuville, *Teleilat Ghassul* (Rome, 1934), pl. 34, and for the chalcolithic age in that region Albright,

¹ The place-name as Dāmiyeh survives in a wady, tell and ford at the confluence of the Jabbok with the Jordan, 24 miles N of the Dead Sea; see Albr., *BASOR* 35 (1929), 13, with picture of the present ferry, and similarly J. D. Whiting in *Nat. Geog. Mag.*, 1940, 82. It was by this ford doubtless that Gideon crossed over to Succoth (Jud. 8⁴¹). Sellin in his Comm. has suggested finding the name in Hos. 6⁷, reading *b'dm* for *k'dm*.

JPOS 1935, 199 ff.—**47.** *And Solomon deposited all the vessels. Because of the exceeding great multitude the weight of the bronze could not be reckoned.* The first sentence appears to be correction of “S. made all the vessels,” v.⁴⁸. Rashi, Kimchi saw the difficulty of the statement in the sequence, and following LHeb. and Aramaic usage of the verb, translated, as in the language of the Protestant VSS, e.g., EVV, with: *And S. left all the vessels unweighed, because they were exceeding many.* With omission of the first sentence, the balance is a natural sequel of v.⁴⁶. The Grr. attached this statement to v.⁴⁵, as does Šanda.

48-51. Solomon's gilded furnishings of the temple, and the completion of all the work. || 2 Ch. 4¹⁹⁻⁵¹. The whole passage, with exception of v.^{51b}, is late, vv.^{48, 49} being drawn from the specifications for the tabernacle furniture in Ex. **48.** *The golden altar: cf. the wooden altar overlaid with pure gold, Ex. 30^{1ff.}; the table on which is the bread of the Presence, of gold, ib. 25^{23ff.}*, where again the table is simply overlaid with gold. **49.** Apart from the parallel in Ch. history knows of only one candelabrum, as against the *ten* noted here, *of refined gold; cf. the elaborate description of it in Ex. 25^{31ff.}*, the details of which are pursued here with *the flower-work, the (seven) lamps, and the tongs, all of gold.* The original document in II. 25^{13ff.}, recording the first despoliation of the temple by Nebuchadnezzar, speaks only in general terms of his looting of temple and palace and his breaking in pieces all the vessels of gold which Solomon king of Israel made in the house of YHWH. **50a.** The passage is dependent upon II. 25^{14f.} = Jer. 52^{18f.}, listing the booty taken from the temple at its destruction, but with the exaggeration of making all the vessels of *refined gold*, whereas the original document distinguishes them as some of silver and some of gold. *Cups: or rather large bowls: otherwise than here and in the parallels only of profane use, Ex. 12²², 2 Sam. 17²⁸; snuffers: only here and in the parallels; sprinkling-basins: sup. v.⁴⁰, and e.g., Ex. 27³; pans: e.g., ib. 25²⁹; fire-pans: e.g., ib. 27³*—these latter two doubtless for incense. **50b.** *The hinge-sockets: EVV hinges.* The whole passage is clumsy and profuse; Ⓔ reads it, and Stade retains it; Šanda reduces it to *and the hinges of the doors of the inner house and of the hall, of gold (cf. BH).* See

Notes further for some of these words. **51a.** *And was finished all the work which king Solomon did in the house of YHWH*: an editorial *finale*. **51b.** Historical memorandum on Solomon's placement in the temple of *his father David's dedications*, namely 'the vessels of gold and silver and bronze,' taken from Hadadezer and all the nations, according to 2 Sam. 8⁹⁻¹². But the passage is read with difficulty; *cf.* the attempts in EVV. It might be simplest to reduce it to: *And Solomon brought the dedications of his father David, the silver and the gold, into the treasuries of the house of YHWH*, and to regard the inset, and *the vessels he gave*, as an added reference to Solomon's own gifts. For such additional 'treasures' *cf.* the shields of gold which Solomon made and Shishak looted (14²⁶).

40. הָיוּם: but 21 MSS הָיוּם, Grr., *Χειραμ*; this variant from v.¹³ has been intruded from Ch.—הַבְּרִיתָה: read הַבְּרִיתָה with 43 MSS Ken., deR., Ch., Grr., *פ*, as at v.⁴⁵.—בֵּית י: for this locative use *cf.* v.⁴⁵.—**45.** הָאֵלֵל: *ק*ר. הָאֵלֵל is required; the word is unnecessary and is to be omitted with Grr., *פ*.—בֵּית י: Grr., exc. g i, plus "and the 48 pillars of the king's house and the Lord's house, all the works of the king made Hiram (of bronze)." The item of 'the 48 pillars' Then., Šanda regard as of Heb. origin and historical moment.—מַכְרֵם: the fem. is expected; Grr., *αρκη* (?), exc. *ט* η *ק*.—**46.** הַמֶּלֶךְ: *ט* *ט* *א* om.; the unexpected subject may indicate the royal factory.—בַּמְּעֵבָה הָאֲדָמָה: Ch., בעֵבֵי הָא; the first noun Albright reads as pl., and om. art. in the second; see Comm.—**48.** וַיַּעַשׂ: Grr., κ. εδωκεν (exc. B. κ. ελαβεν), on the ground that S. was not the maker.—בֵּית: the noun is locative, as at v.⁴⁰.—**50.** הַכַּפֹּת: the obscure word is variously rendered in VSS; Engl. 'cups' comes from 'hydriæ' of *פ*; see Honeyman, *JTS* 37 (1936), 56 ff., for attempt to find the primitive threshold altar in this ritual object.—הַכַּפֹּת: EVV 'spoons,' JV 'pans.' Albr. identifies such a vessel, understood as a censer, with a bowl (found at Tell Beit Mirsim) with figuration of a lion's mouth, in which a pipe was inserted for blowing the incense; see *BASOR* 47 (1932), 15 ff., with additional plate, no. 48, 1, and his further remarks in *AASOR* 21-22 (1943), 73, n. 2. For such sacred vessels see F. Prezeworski's study of Syrian censers, *Syria*, 1930, 139 ff., and for Palestine that by G. M. Crowfoot, *PEQ* 1940, 150 ff.; *cf.* also Burrows, *WMTS* 214 f., with two plates.—הַפְתָּוֹת: EVV 'hinges,' with *ט* *פ*; Grr., *θυρωματα*, 'doorways.' Haupt has a diffuse discussion of the word; G. R. Driver connects it with Akk. *pūtu*, 'forehead' (*JTS* 38, 38; *ZDMG* 1937, 347), followed by L. Köhler (*JBL* 1940, 36). But it means the 'cardines feminæ'; *cf.* Is. 3¹⁷.—**51.** בָּל: OGrr. om., not desiring to limit Solomon's works

Ch. 8. The dedication of the temple. || 2 Ch. 5-7; *cf. Ant.*, viii, 4. The chapter contains the history of the entry of the ark into the shrine of the temple, vv.¹⁻¹¹; a poetic word of Solomon, taken from an ancient collection, vv.¹²⁻¹³; his prayers of dedication, vv.¹⁴⁻⁶¹; the sequel, the sacrifices and the great feast, vv.^{62-64. 65-66}.

The history has its simpler, primitive parallel in the story of David's fetching of the ark to David's City in 2 Sam. 6, and a late parallel in the accounts of the dedication of the second temple, Ezra 6¹⁶⁻¹⁸, 1 Esd. 5^{47ff.}. From Assyria we possess numerous foundation-stones with inscriptions invoking divine blessing upon the monarch and his offspring, *e.g.*, of Sennacherib (*ARA* 2, nos. 440, 455, 458), and also dedicatory texts, of which order is one of Ashurbanipal's with regard to a golden incense-altar (*ib.* nos. 999 ff.): "For all time may Marduk look with favour upon that incense-altar, and on me, Ashurbanipal, have mercy when I call upon thee, may he receive my petitions, hear my prayers, freedom from sickness grant me."

The chapter is very composite. An ancient citation is balanced by long prayers in Deuteronomistic style, while the historical sections have been extensively swollen with later accretions.

1.¹ Then convoked² Solomon³ the elders of Israel,⁴ all the heads of the tribes, 'the hereditary chiefs of the Bné-Israel to king Solomon',⁵ 'to Jerusalem'⁶ to bring up the ark of 'the covenant of'⁷ YHWH from David's City, that is Sion. **2.** 'And were convoked to king Solomon all the men of Israel'⁸ 'in the moon of Ethanim'⁹ 'at the Haj, that is the seventh month'.¹⁰ **3.** 'And came all the elders of Israel'.¹¹ And the priests bore the ark **4.** 'and they brought up the ark of YHWH'¹² and the tent of meeting and all the holy vessels that were in the tent, 'and there brought them up the priests and the Levites',¹³ **5.** and the king 'Solomon'¹⁴ and all 'the assembly of'¹⁵ Israel, 'those assembled to him along with him'¹⁶ before the ark, sacrificing sheep and cattle that might not be counted 'nor measured for quantity'.¹⁷ **6.** And the priests brought in the ark 'of the covenant of YHWH'¹⁸ to its place, to the shrine of the house, to the holy of holies under the wings of the cherubs. **7.** For the cherubs were spreading wings over the place of the ark, and the cherubs shrouded the ark and its staves above;

8. and the staves were so long that the ends of the staves were seen from the sanctity in front of the shrine, but they could not be seen outside; 'and they are there to this day'.¹⁹ 9. There was nothing in the ark except the two tables of stone that Moses deposited there at Horeb, by which YHWH made a covenant with the Bnê-Israel, when they came out of the land of Egypt. 10. And it came to pass, when the priests came out of the sanctity—now the cloud was filling the house of YHWH—11. that the priests were not able to stand to minister in the presence of the cloud, for the Glory of YHWH filled the house 'of YHWH'.²⁰

The original elements of the story may be contained in the following simplification :

1. Then convoked Solomon the elders of Israel to bring up the ark of YHWH from David's City in the moon of Ethanim. 3. And the priests bore the ark, 5. with the king and all Israel before the ark, sacrificing sheep and cattle that might not be counted. 6. And the priests brought in the ark to its place, to the shrine of the house.

¹ Ⓞ Ⓞ^L a preceding plus: "and it came to pass, when S. finished building the house of the Lord and his own house after 20 years [=9¹⁰], then," etc. ² Ⓞ+' the king.' ³ 46 MSS+' all '=Grr., Ⓞ Ⓞ. ⁴ Many MSS, edd.+ 'and '=Ch. ⁵ =Ch.; Ⓞ Ⓞ^L om. ⁶ Grr., 'in Sion.' ⁷ MS 107 om. ⁸ =Ch.; Ⓞ Ⓞ^L om. ⁹ Ch. om. ¹⁰ =Ch.; Grr. om., exc. A=Ⓞ Ⓞ. ¹¹ =Ch.; Grr. om., exc. A. ¹² Grr. om., exc. A x. ¹³ =Ch.; Grr. om., exc. A Z g x e₂. ¹⁴ =Ch.; Grr. om., exc. A x. ¹⁵ =Ch.; Grr. om., exc. A. ¹⁶ =Ch., omitting 'with him'; Grr. om., exc. A x. ¹⁷ =Ch.; Grr. om., exc. A x. ¹⁸ =Ch.; Grr. om., exc. A Z x e₂ al. ¹⁹ =Ch.; Grr. om., exc. A x. ²⁰ Ⓞ om.; cf. Ch. The following notes may be added here. 2. אֲתָנִים: n.b. קִרְבָּאָה, Sym., τὸ ἀρχαῖον.—3. 'the priests': Ch., 'the Levites,' cf. v.4, where Ch. 'the priests, the Levites.'—7. וַיִּסְבוּ: Ch. וַיִּכְסוּ; St. properly defends the forceful verb of the text. Jos. combines both texts.—בריו: Grr., τὰ ἀγαθὰ αὐτοῦ=τὰ ἀγιασμένα, v.8, i.e., read as בריו; cf. Jer. 4¹¹.—8. הִקְרַשׁ: mng.? Ch., הארון; Kamp. prop. הַמִּקְדָּשׁ; see Burn., St.—9. לְהַתְּתֵם הָאֲבֹנִים: Grr.+' the tables of the covenant'; the duplicate being simplified in 2 MSS. The same exegesis appears in the plus of Ⓞ: "the ten words of the covenant (which the Lord decreed with the Sons of Israel, when they came out of Egypt)." The addition was made to obtain an antecedent for אֲשֶׁר ²⁰; hence the proposed insertion of לְהַתְּתֵם הָאֲבֹנִים before the relative clause (cf. BH—but this not 'cum Græco' as alleged, in regard to the position of the phrase). But there is used absolutely of making a covenant, e.g., 1 Sam. 11², and the rel. pron. is used loosely; for defence of the text, see Keil, Burn.—10. Ch. has a long insertion between the two halves of the v.

The criticism of the text of these vv. has been most varied, depending in part upon the authority of the OGr. text in its greatly apocopated form, in part upon subjective judgment of the strata of the document. In addition to the comm. are to be specially noted Stade's extensive treatment in *SBOT* pp. 98-101, Burney, pp. 104-9, for full treatment of the language, and Hölscher, 'Das Buch der Könige,' in the Gunkel-*Eucharisterion*, pp. 164-6. In vv.¹⁻⁶ there are many redundant phrases, all of late stamp (see Burney), e.g., *the heads of the tribes, the hereditary chiefs* (EVV *princes of the fathers' houses*), v.¹; the introduction of the Levites, v.⁴ (*cf.* Ch.'s corrections in favour of the Levites, vv.^{4.5}, and *cf.* 2 Sam. 15²⁴); *the assembly . . . those assembled*, v.⁵; etc. V.² is reduced above to *in the moon of Ethanim* with OGrr.; the appositional *in the seventh month* is the equivalent dating of the later calendar, *cf.* Bul as the eighth month, 6³⁸. There arises the problem of the sequence of dates, the dedication being assigned to the seventh month, but the completion of the temple (6³⁸) to the eighth month. Following older comm. cited by Poole, Ewald held that the dedication anticipated the complete furnishing and so 'finishing' of the temple by a month, and Keil that he waited for eleven months, thus providing time for the brass work of ch. 7, and so Šanda. Kittel, attributing the present datum to a later source than that of 6^{37f.}, makes the dating a conformation to the celebration of the Succoth festival in the seventh month, for which dispute see below, Comm., 12³². Benzinger excises the reference to Ethanim. Morgenstern in his 'Three Calendars of Ancient Israel,' *HUCA* 1 (1924), 67 ff. (*cf.* also his *Amos Studies*, 146 ff.), argues that the assembly of the people was in Ethanim and the octave-feast had its climax on the first of Bul. Stade (*SBOT*), after a long discussion, retracting his earlier cancellation of the dating as an insertion, retains it, but cannot accommodate it to the datum of 6³⁸. Schmidt (see note 1, Comm., 6^{23ff.}) properly holds that the antique terms 'moon' and 'Ethanim' cannot be late glosses. Morgenstern's theory is most attractive with his argument for a change in Israelite calendars, with the older calendar having its culmination in Bul. The word, *the Haj*, had best be excised, as a back-reference from v.⁶⁵; as Kittel remarks, the word is out of

place. For the accumulation of feasts at this period cf. vv.^{65f.}.

Most variety of critical opinion has arisen over the stratification of vv.⁷⁻¹¹. Stade assigns vv.⁷⁻⁸ to his 'unknown source,' v.⁹ to the Deuteronomist, vv.¹⁰⁻¹¹ to the basic document along with v.¹². Šanda (p. 243) holds that vv.⁷⁻⁹ interfere with the flow of the narrative, and sagaciously observes that vv.^{7-8a} properly belong to the section on the cherubs, 6^{23ff.}, while v.⁹ is Deuteronomic and is to be transposed before v.^{8b}. Hölscher, with some deletions, accepts vv.⁶⁻⁹ as integral, vv.¹⁰⁻¹¹ as a late addition. The present writer however is sceptical as to originality of all of these vv., inclusive of the final phrase in v.⁶, *to the holy of holies, under the wings of the cherubs*, the first phrase of which is generally admitted to be secondary, even as it is a gloss in 6¹⁶, while the location as under the cherubs appears superfluous. Certainly vv.⁷⁻⁸ with the stress on the staves of the ark is a very subordinate item indeed; see below. *The sanctity* (Heb. *the holiness*) is a late term, used in Lev. (16², etc.) and Eze. (41²¹, etc.), and so some critics have proposed replacing it with a more concrete word, 'the place.' Vv.¹⁰⁻¹¹ record a miraculous phenomenon with a clumsy, reiterative statement; it is quite in line with the passage Ex. 40^{34ff.}, how "after Moses finished the work" on the tabernacle, "Then the cloud covered the tent of meeting, and the Glory of YHWH filled the tabernacle; and Moses was not able to enter the tent of meeting, because the cloud abode thereon, and the Glory of YHWH filled the tabernacle." Cf. also the entry of the Glory into the temple in Eze.'s vision, 43^{1ff.}. The Glory is the perceptible Presence of Deity, visually represented as a cloud.

1. The adv. *then* belongs to the archival style, and definitely so at v.¹², and did not originally refer to 6²⁸; see Burney, and the writer's 'Archival Data in the Book of Kings,' 49. A preceding plus in OGrr. (see Note above) attempted to precise the time. The *elders* were the community chiefs, hereditary sheikhs; cf. 21^{8ff.}. *That is Sion*: a gloss from Ch., 'David's City' having become archaic. 7. 8. The staves of the ark and their limited visibility have caused interminable discussion; see Kimchi at length, the comm. cited by Poole (a whole column), and of moderns may be noted Thenius,

Keil, and Šanda. The optics is a problem, with the ancient question whether the staves extended on the line of the axis of the building or at right angles to it. Galling in his 'Das Allerheiligste,' *JPOS* 1932, 43 ff., contends for the former view, finding strained support from his argument for a raised podium in the sanctuary. But it appears to have been generally ignored that there could have been no interest in the extension of the staves except so far as these indicated the presence of the ark, which was not visible, and thus we have to assume the presence of 'the veil' (an important item in the tabernacle-furnishing [Ex. 26^{31a}, etc.]) as concealing the sacred object from vulgar gaze, so making the staves themselves of profound interest to the devotee (*cf.* the specifications, Ex. 25^{12a}). The veil concealed the ark, only the staves might be seen projecting right and left by one standing near the narrow door of the sanctuary, but not from a greater distance. For the veil in the later temple *cf.* 1 Mac. 1²², Mt. 27⁵¹, Heb. 6¹⁹, etc. Our passage comes from one who had actually seen so much of the holy shrine. On an Akko-Ptolemaic coin of Gallienus a portable shrine with the accompanying poles is exhibited (Cook, *Rel. of Anc. Palestine*, 104). The comment, *and they are there unto this day*, is not a guarantee of originality, *vs.* Burney, as Olmstead argues (*AJSL* 30 [1913], 33 f.); *cf.* 9²¹, 12¹⁹; II. 8²², 10²⁷, 17²³. 34. 41. 9. The note that *there was nothing in the ark except the two tables of stone* is the remark of an anxious commentator, who may have wished to dissipate false rumours to the contrary (so Benzinger). There was the later tradition that Aaron's staff and the pot of manna were also included (Heb. 9⁴); see the older comm., cited by Poole at length.

VV.¹². 13. Citation of Solomon's ode.

12. *Then spake Solomon :*

YHWH said, he would dwell in the dense-cloud.

13. *Built indeed have I an exalted house for thee,*

A place for thy dwelling forever.

One change is made from the EVV, etc., in the translation 'an exalted house,' in place of 'a house of habitation'; see Note.

The OGrr. transferred the passage to the end of v.⁵³, presumably regarding it as ritually secondary to the following solemn prayer of consecration. 6^m MSS have it in both places.

Of radical critical importance are the additions in the OGrr. : a prefixed hemistich, a variant from the theme of 'building,' and at the end citation of the source of the passage. For the expanded Gr. form see Wellhausen, *Comp.*, 208 ff. ; J. Halévy, *RS* 8 (1900), 218 ff. ; Driver, *Int.*, 192 ; Kittel, Burney, and Stade in *SBOT*, the last scholar adopting none of the additions from \mathfrak{C} . Further for the Gr. text see Burkitt, *JTS* 10 (1909), 439 ff. ; Thackeray, *ib.*, 11, 518 ff., and *The Septuagint and Jewish Worship*, 76 ff. The OGr. preface reads, ἡλιον ἐγνώρισεν ἐν οὐρανῷ Κύριος, "the sun did the Lord make known in heaven" ; for the verb \mathfrak{C}^L has ἔστησεν, 'set,' and this indeed makes better sense. It has been proposed that הַבִּין as the basis of the latter rdg. was misread הַבִּין, giving the rdg. of \mathfrak{C} . But הַבִּין is never so translated in the Greek. Wellhausen accepted Lucian's rdg., and has been largely followed ; but see Kamphausen, Burkitt, Thackeray, and now Rahlfs (*SS* 3, 62) for the conclusion that this text is merely an 'amelioration.' Burkitt's suggestion of הוֹפֵץ, *i.e.*, "(Sun,) shine forth," is arbitrary. There is the distinction between the so evident sun and the Deity who will not be seen, a fine theological contrast, and so the fragment in the Gr. appears to be original.

The interior variant of the OGrr. is the change of "I will build (a house)," to the impv., "Build (a house)," and for this Wellhausen has reconstructed what he regards as the original Hebrew. Šanda has attempted combination of both forms. But it is best to abide by the judgment of Kittel (also in *BH*), Benzinger, Stade for the preservation of \mathfrak{H} . The Hebrew is bold and original, in contrast to the divine self-assertion preceding.

The original purport and circumstances of this ode, of which only the first lines are quoted, are wholly obscure. Was it cautious censorship which deleted from the Hebrew the first hemistich, preserved however in the Greek ? The theme, curtly expressed, is that of the manifest phenomenon of the brilliant sun in contrast to the invisibility of Deity, who prefers the deep darkness, is invisible, *e.g.*, Ps. 18¹² (and so even to the spiritually minded, *cf.* Is. 45¹⁵), and for whom Solomon prepared a dark adytum. This interpretation is in

contrast to current theories, largely starting from the present passage, concerning the sun-cult at Jerusalem, in combination with the theory of the penetration of the rays of the equinoctial sun through the eastern door of the temple into the adytum. See literature cited above in introduction to ch. 6. There may be noted here the argument in F. J. Hollis's essay, cited there, adopting and expanding a theory proposed by von Gall, that these vv. were part of an oracle delivered in connexion with an eclipse of the sun, which may be identified with the one that occurred May 22, 948 B.C.—as approximate enough (!). But the contrast of Deity as artist and his creation is a constant theme in Hebrew poetry, e.g., Ps. 19. Dussaud properly argues (*RHR* 63 [1911], 336 ff.) that here YHWH is aligned rather with Hadad the storm-god, not with the sun. For the *dense-cloud* (EVV *thick darkness*—see Haupt in *SBOT*) cf. 'the cloud,' v.¹⁰, which also normally shrouds Deity, e.g., in Ex. 24^{15ff.}. Critical views on the passage are indeed polarized. Morgenstern in his 'Book of the Covenant,' *HUCA* 5 (1928), 40, n. 46, comes to the conclusion that these verses "smack so strongly of this Deuteronomic theology that it is practically impossible to ascribe an earlier origin to them"—an unconvincing argument; that school was not poetical. Others, wishing to find original paganism, would rewrite the text; e.g., Gunkel: "Baal establishes the sun in the heavens, Yahweh said he would dwell in gloom" (*Die Lade Jahves*, 1920, 62 f.); and H. G. May, rejecting the Greek first hemistich as an attempt of the Seventy to disassociate YHWH from the sun-cult, proceeds to invent out of line 3: "Verily I have built a shrine of Zebul for you" ('Some Aspects of Solar Worship at Jerusalem,' *ZAW* 1937, 269 ff.). But rewriting of ancient poetic fragments is all in vain.

There follows in the OGrr. the postscript: *At the dedication. Is it not written in the Book of Song?* A documentary source is thus asserted. For the last word Wellhausen suggested a corruption from *yashar*, and the collection would then have been the Book of Jashar, cited Josh. 10¹³, 2 Sam. 1¹⁸. Kittel (but cf. *BH*), Šanda retain **י**. See Note.

12. בערפל: **ⓈⓈ** εκ γροφου.—13. זָלַל: 'exalted,' and so correctly for the mng. of the root and its derivatives at large BDB, but subsequent Lexx., König, *HAW*, GB, have abandoned this mng.,

replacing it with 'dwelling'; the latter sense is that of the VSS, EVV, etc. Schrader (*CIOT* 1, 174) recognized the correct mng. here, and offers an Akk. parallel to the phrase. For the use of the word as 'exalted,' and so as divine 'prince,' see at length Note on 'Jezebel,' 16³¹, also on 'Beel-zebub,' II. 1³.—Gr. supplement, *ἐπι κειροτοητος* = ܩܘܪܘܢܐ.—[*ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τ.*] *ὠδης*: the word 'song' was used in the collective sense, as noted in later canonical lists by J. R. Harris, *Odes and Psalms of Solomon* (1920), 2, 2 f. It may be proposed that instead of the alleged misreading of *yāšār* as *haššār*, the reverse is the case for the former word in its occurrences, since it has never been explained.

VV.¹⁴⁻⁶¹. Solomon's prayer of dedication: vv.¹⁴⁻²¹, the history of the undertaking; vv.²²⁻⁵³, the prayers, with litany, vv.³¹⁻⁵³; vv.⁵⁴⁻⁶¹, the blessing and exhortation. || 2 Ch. 6³⁻⁴², with omission of the royal blessing, and addition of citation from Ps. 132. Cf. *Ant.*, viii, 4, 2, 3.

Apart from the rather casual references to the priests in vv.⁶⁻¹⁰ *supra*, the king appears as the sole liturgist, *summus sacerdos*, the officiant in prayer, in exhortation, in blessing. The like royal function is presented in the case of David (2 Sam. 6), of Jeroboam (12³³, 13), of Hezekiah at his prayer before the Presence (II. 19^{14ff.}); only indirectly do we learn of a high priest (II. 22^{3ff.}). This unique position of the king is not to be ascribed to foreign ideas; rather it was the genuine development of the natural priesthood of the father of the family, its representative before Deity. The development of the cult in its technical details, especially in the central sanctuary of the people, produced the increasingly potent castes of priests and Levites ('attendants'), who in the later history of the kingdom established themselves as a powerful estate spiritual, which could defy the king himself (*cf.* the tradition in 2 Ch. 26^{16ff.}). The dispute between the spiritual and the temporal power characterizes all history of established religion. Early Israelite royalty thus followed the oriental tradition of priestly prerogative.¹ For recent studies of the sacred function of Israelite monarchy see Mowinckel, *Psalmenstudien*, 2 (1922), 297 ff.; C. R. North, 'Religious Aspects of Hebrew Monarchy,' *ZAW* 1932, 8 ff.; H. Gunkel,

¹ For Mesopotamia see Jastrow, *Religious Beliefs*, 269 ff.; Jeremias, *HAG* 284; Meissner, *Bab. u. Ass.*, 2, 67 ff.; C. W. McEwan, *The Oriental Origins of Hellenistic Kingship* (1934), esp. pp. 11 ff.

Einl. in die Psalmen, 159 ff.; A. R. Johnson's chapter on 'The Rôle of the King in the Jerusalem Cultus,' in *The Labyrinth*, ed. S. H. Hooke, pp. 8 ff.; Morgenstern, 'A Chapter in the History of the High-Priesthood,' *AJSL* 55 (1938), 1 ff., asserting that throughout the pre-Exilic period in both kingdoms "the king discharged the function of high-priest." Of course in these sacrificial functions the king was the *præsident*, the menial offices of handling the rites being the charge of the priests. The actual royal part of the king appears in the account of Ahaz's personal ritual in connexion with his new altar (II. 16^{12f.}). It should be noted that the term, 'sacrificing,' is used loosely, of the patrons of the sacrifice, e.g., Solomon's wives, with the participles in the feminine (11⁸).

The whole composition is Deuteronomistic, for which fact see Burney's detailed analysis, also Šanda. The problem arises as to its integrity, in detection of various strata and interpolations, with the particular inquiry whether any portions are pre-Exilic. Wellhausen (*Comp.*, 268 f.), Stade (*GVI* 1, 74—*cf.* *SBOT*), Kittel, Kent, *al.*, regard the whole as Exilic at the earliest, along with multiple subsequent additions. On the other hand, Burney considers the document as a whole to be akin to the earliest elements of Deut., and so pre-Exilic. The most crucial of the points of criticism is the section vv.⁴⁴⁻⁵³, repeating the theme of the brief section vv.^{33f.}, and with the hypothesis of an exile of the nation. On the other hand, a sure core of pre-Exilic origin may be found, with Šanda, in the litany of vv.³¹⁻⁴⁰, with intercessions for divine justice, in case of defeat in battle, and as against natural plagues, presupposing an independent people on its own soil. VV.²²⁻²⁶, repeating David's charge to his son (2^{11f.}), with promise of a dynasty, are of pre-Exilic character without question; *cf.* the usual forms in Ass. building inscriptions of prayers for the dynasty (see above, *Comm.*, v.¹). VV.²⁷⁻³⁰ continue the prayer for the king. V.²⁷, *Will God in very truth dwell on the earth? Behold, heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain thee; how much less this house that I have built*, is regarded even by Burney (p. 115), as of Exilic, age comparing Is. 60¹. But the celestial abode of the highest deities was a commonplace in ancient Semitic religion; we need only recall 'Baal-of-the-Heavens,' or 'Heaven,' as he is actually named in the

Sūjīn inscription ; see the writer's note, *HTR* 31 (1938), 145, and *cf.* Am. 9⁶, Hab. 2²⁰. In the history of the Israelite religion YHWH came to be localized peculiarly only with the building of the temple, and even then it was his distinct Presence (Person in Christian theology), or Name, or Glory-Shekinah, that was in residence. As with one development in Christian doctrine, that of the Presence on the altar, along with the dogma of the absolute celestial Deity, so in Israel : *e.g.*, Ps. 20³ is a prayer that YHWH " send thee help out of his sanctuary, and support thee out of Sion," while according to v. 7 the Deity " will answer him from his holy heaven." There may be noted the admirable discussion by Morgenstern in *HUCA* 5 (1928), 37 ff. In the history of religion art has played a large part in definitely localizing the deities. The above presentation argues for the early origin of vv. 22-40. VV. 41-43 are a prayer, not for the later caste of proselytes, but for aliens whose piety may be aroused by the fame of Israel's God and his temple, and this, as will be detailed below, is not necessarily a late feature. To the portion of the composition so analyzed was added a prefatory, vv. 14-21, a duplicate to vv. 22-26, but based on the secondary interpretation of the oracle to David in 2 Sam. 7^{1ff.}. VV. 44-53, as observed above, have definite post-Exilic characteristics. The final distinct section, vv. 54-61, the blessing, culminating in an exhortation to the people—in Christian language a sermon—is an evident addition ; *n.b.* the contradiction of Solomon's rising from his knees, v. 54, and his erect posture before the altar, v. 22.

To cite some essays at minute criticism : Stade (*SBOT*) makes the whole section as practically of one piece, with a few interpolated passages, and excepting vv. 44-51 as a late addition. Šanda attempts minute analysis, and finds the original record of dedication, following vv. 1-14, in vv. 22. 31-39. 54ff., and attributes to Redactors (R and Rj) the remaining sections. Hölscher finds three strata, in this chronological order : A vv. 14-26. 28. 29 ; B vv. 27. 30-43. 52-61 ; C vv. 44-51.

These prayers attributed to Solomon compose one of the noblest flights in sacred oratory from the Deuteronomic school. There are the notes of the infiniteness of Deity and yet of his readiness to dwell with his faithful, of divine grace and of human responsibility, not only of the people but of the

individual conscience (v.³⁸), of the stern righteousness of God which can scatter the nation, and equally of the door of repentance by which they may regain his favour. The chapter was properly chosen as an alternative Haphtarah (lection) for the Succoth festival (*Meg. B.* 21a). It is our earliest representative of such liturgical forms from the ancient temple. Gunkel's *Einleitung in die Psalmen* contains much that illuminates the present liturgy.

14. *And the king turned his face about, and blessed all the assembly of Israel; and all the assembly of Israel was standing.*

15a. *And he said: Blessed is YHWH, the God of Israel.* The common liturgical phrase, *Blessed is YHWH* (see the listing of the cases in Gunkel, *Einl.*, 40), is taken from social language; cf. II. 4²⁹, where EVV properly translate the verb with 'salute'; cf. also v.⁶⁶ *inf.* The phrase has its parallel in Ugaritic texts; see Virolleaud, *Syria*, 1935, 186 f., one of the texts certainly reading, "We have blessed Baal —."

16. *I did not choose a city . . . but I chose David,* etc. The person of David came first in the divine selection. After the first sentence **6** interpolates: "and I chose Jerusalem, that my name might abide there." This plus, to save the hoary fame of the holy city, has been largely accepted, e.g., by BH, Hölcher, but is rejected by Stade (*SBOT*), Šanda; see Stade's reasonable discussion. **17 ff.** The reference is to the history in 2 Sam. 7, which, as Wellhausen has argued (*Comp.*, 254, etc.), and as is generally accepted, is an expanded form of the original promise to *build a house, i.e., a dynasty*; the dynastic promise appears there in vv.^{12ff.}

17. *To build a house for the Name of YHWH.* Cf. 3², *the Name of YHWH.* The Name is a manifestation form of Deity, e.g., physically at Is. 30²⁷; as in all legal language the name is the person. For ancient parallels, Akkadian and Egyptian, see Šanda; there may be added the use of 'the name' in legal sense in an Amarna tablet from Jerusalem, "Behold, the king (Pharaoh) has put his name on the land forever" (Knudtzon, no. 287, lines 60 ff.). **21.** *Wherein is the covenant of YHWH: i.e., the tables, as an engrossed document.* **22.** *And Solomon stood before the altar of YHWH.* For the altar, ignored in ch. 7, but assumed here and at v.⁴⁵, see Comm., vv.^{61ff.} The standing position of the officiant was the rule

as all ancient designs show. Ch. (6¹³) has a long addition *in re* a brazen scaffold, which Solomon used as an oratory, upon which "he stood, and (then) kneeled down"; this relieves the contradiction of the two positions given to him, and also separates locally the royal layman from the altar.

23. *There is none like thee as God.* Cf. Ex. 15¹¹, Ps. 86⁸, **27.** *But in very truth will God dwell on the earth? Behold, heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain thee; how much less this house that I have built!* The v. is as noble an expression as is found anywhere for the infiniteness of Deity. Cf. Jer. 23²⁴, "Do I not fill heaven and earth?—saith YHWH." And in the Biblical tradition Augustine's corresponding confession may be recalled: "et quis locus est in me, quo veniat in me Deus meus? quo Deus veniat in me, Deus qui fecit cælum et terram? . . . An vero cælum et terra, quæ fecisti, et in quibus me fecisti, capiunt te?" (*Conf.*, i, 2). Grotius compares Virgil (*Ecl.*, iii, 60): "Iovis omnia plena," and Lucan, "Estne dei sedes nisi terra, et pontus, et aer, et cælum et virtus?"

30. A contradiction is found by some critics between the prayer *unto this place*, as the Muslim *ḵiblah*, and the divine audience *unto the place of thy abode*, the latter as being a later, spiritualizing addition. But the criticism is far-fetched; the *ḵiblah* is merely the *point d'appui*, and the contrast, not contradiction, is not amiss after v.²⁷; cf. the like contrast in Ps. 20^{3. 7}. There follows, vv.³¹⁻⁵³, in the language of the Church, the earliest extensive Litany. **31. 32.** A prayer for divine judgment in the purgation by oath. There is to be noted the primacy of order given by this litany to the element of justice between man and man. **31.** The v. has difficulties of text, for which cf. the various renderings in EVV, and see Note. For the subject see J. Pedersen, *Der Eid bei den Semiten* (1914), with parallels from Akkadian, Greek, Roman fields, and for the present subject in particular cc. 5, 6; also H. Schmidt, 'Die Gebete der Angeklagten,' in *O.T. Essays*, ed. Simpson, 143 ff., and his enlarged treatment in *ZAW Beiheft* 49 (1928). The word generally translated 'oath' (*'ālāh*) is more exactly a 'hypothetical curse,' or 'Bann' (so Pedersen, pp. 113 ff.); at Lev. 5¹, Prov. 29²⁴ JV excellently renders it with 'adjuration.' With these passages cf. the adjuration of a suspected wife in Num. 5^{11ff.}, where the ordeal

is enacted 'before YHWH,' even as here, 'before the altar in this house.' **32.** *According to his right* (*šēdeḱ*), not *righteousness*, but primarily a legal term; cf. K. F. Euler, *ZAW* 1938, 278 f. **33. 34.** The major external disaster would come from foreign enemies. **35. 36.** The major internal calamity, namely the drought, arises from the peculiar physical features of Canaan; cf. Jer. 14^{1ff.}, Joel 1^{8ff.}, etc. **37.** Other famine-producing plagues are listed: *blasting* (e.g., 'by the east wind,' Gen. 41⁶), *mildew*, *locust*, *grasshopper* (with asyndeton); the last term is wrongly translated 'caterpillar' by EVV. For these last two practically synonymous words along with other synonyms see Commentaries on Joel 1, and for such plagues in general Dalman, *A. u. S.*, 2, 296 f., 323 ff., 344 ff., etc. **38.** *Whatsoever prayer and supplication be made by any man of all thy people Israel* [OGrr. om.], *who shall know each one the affliction of his own heart, and shall spread forth his palms toward this house: 39. then do thou hear in heaven, the place of thy abode, and forgive, and do, and give to each man according to all his ways, as thou knowest his heart, for thou alone knowest the heart of all the sons of men.* The word translated 'affliction' is general term for any kind of plague (e.g., Ex. 11¹, etc.—and so EVV here after פ 'plaga'); but the closest approach to the denotation of the word here appears at 1 Sam. 10²⁶, where the verb of the same root appears: "and there went with him (Saul) the men of valour whose hearts God had touched" (origin of a phrase of Christian piety). For such ancient scrupulousness cf. Pss. 51; 19¹³, and see Gunkel, pp. 192 ff., 222 f. Kimchi rightly interprets the point here as of the hidden knowledge or concern of the heart as distinct from public knowledge, *i.e.*, the sense of conscience, and indeed with the latter word Heb. *heart* may well be translated here. It is anticipation of the 'conscience' of the N.T., e.g., Jn. 8⁹, Acts 24¹⁶, and Paul's great confession in Rom. 9. See Poole for various interpretations. For the spreading forth of the open hands *towards this house*, cf. Ps. 28², etc. This section advances from communal causes to those of the individual whose heart is touched by God, and who would find release. For the divine knowledge of the human heart cf. Jer. 17^{9ff.}. **40.** *In order that they may revere thee*, etc.: cf. Dt. 31¹³, etc. The usual English for the verb,

'fear,' is most unfortunate; the noun of the same root should be translated 'religion.' **41-43.** The prayer for *the foreigner* (EVV *stranger*) who comes to worship in the temple. This refers to aliens from a foreign land (not the *gêr*, the settled alien, whose liberties were provided for, Num. 15^{14ff.}), who may be attracted to the glorious national shrine and its God; the basis of this generous prayer may have been diplomatic missions which paid their respects to the national Deity, as in the proposed case of the Cushite embassy (Is. 18⁷), and the legend about Alexander, how he went up into the temple and offered sacrifice there (*Ant.*, xi, 8, 5—*per se* a possible occurrence). But there may well have been cases of sincere devotion on part of Gentiles; *cf.* the story of Naaman (II. 5). For the prospect of a wider conversion see Ps. 68^{30f.}. **44. 45.** The prayer in war: parallel to vv.^{33f.}, but the war here is precisised as a holy enterprise. **46-53.** The prayer in defeat and exile. The prayer toward Jerusalem from abroad is witnessed to in story in Dan. 6¹¹, 1 Esd. 4⁵⁸, Tob. 3¹¹. For the religion of the pre-Exilic Diaspora *cf.* Gunkel, pp. 262 f., holding that Pss. 61, 63 have such origin. **46.** Deportation to a *land of the enemy, far off or near*, has caused question as to the second item; but among the colonists settled by the Assyrians in Samaria were people from Syrian Hamath as well as from Mesopotamia. **52.** *That thine eyes may be opened*, etc.: Stade regards this as without connexion with 'the interpolation of vv.⁴⁴⁻⁵¹, but fails to restore a connexion; in the profuse diction of the prayer too great nicety of consecution may not be expected. **54-61.** The peroration of the prayer: Solomon *blessed all the congregation of Israel*, along with prayer for divine grace and exhortation to the people. Ch. omitted this section because of its character as a benediction (perquisite of the priests, see Num. 6^{22ff.}), replacing it with account of the descent of fire from heaven, which consumed the sacrifices. **54.** For the contradiction between the king's arising from his knees and v.²² see above. Stade, criticizing piecemeal the phraseology of the second half of the v., would excise *he arose—(v.⁵⁵) and stood*, but this appears as an arbitrary attempt to get order out of a composite narrative. For such a royal prayer of thanksgiving *cf.* Babylonian examples cited by Gunkel, 284 ff. **57. 58.** The blessing proper. Šanda rightly

comments that according to this blessing the people have need of the divine grace for aid in keeping God's laws, and "das ist eine sittliche Auffassung, welche über die Moral anderer Kulturvölker Vorderasiens weit hinausreicht." 60. *YHWH, he is the God.* This credal expression appears in a strenuous scene, 18³⁹ (*q.v.*), and may have been a current battle-cry. Cf. Islamic "There is no god but God" (*allāh*, 'the God,' as here in the Hebrew).

VV.⁶²⁻⁶⁶. The great dedication feast and dismissal of the congregation. || 2 Ch. 7⁴⁻¹⁰; cf. *Ant.*, viii, 4, 45.

62. *And the king and all 'Israel with him' [OGrr. the sons of Israel] were making sacrifice before YHWH.* 63. *And Solomon [Ch., OGrr. +the king] sacrificed the sacrifice of peace-offerings 'which he sacrificed to YHWH' [an added id est], 22,000 cattle 'and 120,000 sheep' [⊗ (B Z a₂) om., Jos. has]; and they dedicated the house of YHWH, the king and all the Bnê-Israel.* 64. *On that day the king consecrated the centre of the court that is before the house of YHWH, for he offered there the holocaust 'and the oblation' (Ch. om.) and the fat sacrifices of the peace-offerings, for the bronze altar that was before YHWH was too small to contain the holocaust and the oblation 'and the fat sacrifices' [⊗ (B Z a₂) om.] of the peace-offerings.* 65. *And Solomon celebrated at that time the Haj and all Israel with him, a great convocation, from the Entrance to Hamath to the Wady of Egypt, before YHWH our God [OGrr. +in the house that he built, eating and drinking and rejoicing before the Lord our God], seven days 'and seven days, fourteen days' [OGrr. om.; Jos. 'twice seven days'].* 66. *On the eighth day he dismissed the people, and 'they blessed the king' [⊗ (B Z a₂) he blessed it]; and they went home rejoicing and happy of heart for 'all' [OGrr. om.] the goodness which YHWH had done to his servant David and his people Israel.*

The above display presents the materials for the criticism of the text. The section is late, Deuteronomic according to Kittel, Stade, *al.*, and offers a picture of the celebration as it might have been; as Mowinckel remarks: later editors had no records of such an event, "they pictured the ceremonies as they were practised in their own times" (*Psalmenstudien*, 2, 109). Hölscher regards the whole section as a late mid-rash-like story, reminiscent of the Chronicler. Ch. omits

peace-offerings which he sacrificed to YHWH (v.⁶³), as an only partial duplicate of the list in v.⁶⁴. The items of the thousands of sacrificial victims (that for the sheep is doubtless secondary) are exaggerations; *cf.* the far simpler figures for a similar celebration, 2 Ch. 29^{31ff.}. There may be compared the tradition of Cræsus offering to the Delphic god '3000 beasts of every kind fit for sacrifice' (Her., i, 50); and similarly the assertion in a Minæan building inscription of dedicatory sacrifices 'in fifteen courts' (the Arab. noun the same as the Heb. word here; see Halévy, nos. 192, 199, Hommel, *Chrest.*, 102). For Assyrian amplification of numbers see Olmstead, *Ass. Historiography*, e.g., p. 41, with a case where an original of 1253 sheep has been expanded by later scribes to 100,225. *They dedicated*: the communal plural is of interest. In Ch., v.⁹, the later festal term for dedication, *hanukkāh*, is used (but for the dedication of the altar, *cf.* Num. 7¹⁰). **64.** *The centre of the court* cannot be further precised; the reference must be to the enlarged area surrounding the altar, generally supposed to have stood on the Rock (*eṣ-Ṣahrah*), which large space would have been used for extraordinary festivals. The item of *the oblation*, a vegetable offering, is repeated, but appears *de trop*. *The bronze altar* is described at 2 Ch. 4¹, and ascribed to Hiram as the artist; strangely enough it is omitted in the list of Hiram's works above, although currently accepted in the narrative; Benzinger attributes the omission to Puritan objection, and *cf.* Ex. 20^{21f.}. This altar is referred to below, 9²⁵, and again, II. 16^{10ff.}, in the story of its removal and replacement with another of new fashion. A bronze altar (with the same Hebrew words) is recorded by Yehaumilk, king of Gebal, among his donations to the temple of the Lady of Gebal. The present altar doubtless replaced that of David's on Araunah's threshing-floor (2 Sam. 24²⁵). See the literature bearing on the temple cited in introduction to Comm. on ch. 6 and on 6^{20f.}, and in particular Kittel, 'Der Brandopferaltar,' in his *Studien*, 146 ff., and J. De Groot, *Die Altäre des salomonischen Tempelhofes*, BWAT 2 (1924). **65.** *From the Entrance to Hamath to the Wady of Egypt*: *cf.* the terms for the extent of the Israelite state, 'from the Entrance to Hamath to the Sea/Wady of the Arabah,' II. 14²⁵, Am. 6¹⁴. The first term indicates the opening into the Syrian Biḳ'ah,

the great valley between the two Lebanons, while the second is identified with the Wady el-'Arish; see Abel, *GP* 1, pt. 2, ch. 2, and K. Elliger, 'Die Nordgrenze des Reiches Davids,' *Pjb.*, 32 (1936), 34 ff. **65. 66.** The passage has its parallel in Ch., vv.⁹¹: "And they made on the eighth day a solemn assembly, for the dedication of the altar they celebrated seven days, and the Haj seven days. And on the twenty-third day of the seventh month he dismissed the people," etc. From this quarter Ki. has been contaminated with the plus (*seven days*) and *seven days, fourteen days*, failing in \textcircled{S} . Ch. distinguishes two feasts, one of the dedication of the altar (not of the temple!), the other of the yearly Haj, Succoth or feast of Booths, with Jos. here *σκηνοπηγία*. For such a reputed additional feast of seven days *cf.* the one attached to Hezekiah's great festival acc. to 2 Ch. 30²³ⁿ. For the accumulation of festivals at this season of the year see Mowinckel, *Psalmenstudien*, II. *Das Thronbesteigungsfest Jahwäs und der Ursprung der Eschatologie*, 44-145, with which *cf.* Gunkel's criticism and partial acceptance, *Einkl. in die Psalmen*, 100 ff. See also Morgenstern, 'Supplementary Studies in the Calendars of Ancient Israel,' *HUCA* 10 (1935), with bibliography of his extensive treatments of the subject. There may be contained in the Chronicler's report of a double feast a true tradition of an annual pre-Exilic feast of Hanukkah or Dedication; see Montgomery, 'The Dedication Feast in the O.T.,' *JBL* 29 (1910), 29 ff., with parallels from the Greek, Roman, Christian fields for the 'natal day' of temples and churches. In sacred calendars there is always careful arrangement of feasts so that they may not interfere with one another, and there may well have been a later distinction between Succoth and Dedication. For the accompanying festal meal *cf.* 2 Sam. 6¹⁹, Neh. 8¹⁰ⁿ. *They blessed the king*: \textcircled{S} transposed subject and object; but the people's blessing here, as in good Oriental use, was the grateful response of the people; *cf.* the royal 'blessing of YHWH,' vv.^{15. 56}.

In the following Notes the variations of Ch. are noted only when they bear upon the present text. **14.** קהל 1⁰: OGrr. om., even as Heb. MS Ken. 1 om. 2.⁰—**15.** ישראל: Grr. + 'to-day,' and so at v.⁵⁶; *cf.* 5²¹.—**16.** סכל שבטי: \textcircled{S} and \textcircled{S}^L variously. There is an inconcinnity between the 'choosing of any tribe' and the 'choosing

of David,' which Ch. and $\text{\textcircled{C}}$ attempt to amend with plusses, partly accepted by Kit. and *BH*; Heb. MS Ken. 187 overcomes the same difficulty by omitting $\text{\textcircled{C}}$; but, with St., $\text{\textcircled{H}}$ is to be kept.—19. $\text{\textcircled{B}}$ a, om.—21. $\text{\textcircled{C}}$ סקום לארון: Ch., אה הארון, preferred by St., Šanda, *cf.* *BH*; but $\text{\textcircled{S}}$, which they cite, abbreviates the whole passage.—22. השמים: see Meek, 'The Heb. Accusative,' *JBL* 1940, 224 ff.; St., Hölischer regard as a gloss contradicting v.³⁸, but here the prayer is made in the holy place.—23. התי: see the full discussion of the word by N. Glueck in *ZAW* Beih. 47 (1927).—לעבדך: 3 MSS לעבדך, and *Grr.* read as sing., and singularizing the foll. ppl., followed by $\text{\textcircled{L}}$ with plus 'to David my father.'—24. אה אשר רבה לו: *Grr.*, exc. A= $\text{\textcircled{A}}$, om. through mistranslation of $\text{\textcircled{L}}$ with $\text{\textcircled{A}}$.—26. ועתה: 35 MSS, Ch. יהוה= $\text{\textcircled{VSS}}$, to be accepted.— $\text{\textcircled{Kt}}$.: $\text{\textcircled{K}}$ as sing.= $\text{\textcircled{S}}$ correctly; *cf.* similar cases vv.^{23. 26}.—אשר רבה לעבדך: *OGrr.* om.—27. אלהים: Ch. אה הארם= $\text{\textcircled{OGrr}}$. here, with scruple against nature religion.—בניח: *Grr.*, exc. A= $\text{\textcircled{A}}$, plus 'to thy name,' again with theological restriction.—28. $\text{\textcircled{C}}$ has an abbreviated form, made basis of various corrections, *e.g.*, by Kamp., St., Šanda, but the results are not convincing; *cf.* Burn., *BH*.—29. עיך: ancient *scriptio defectiva*; see Bär, and *cf.* GK §91, k.—לילה ויום: so the order of the parts of the ancient day, *e.g.*, Gen. 1⁵; Ch., *Grr.* with the reverse, and so below, v.⁵⁹.—30. תחנת: 15 MSS תפלת; $\text{\textcircled{C}}$ τ. δεησεως=x+α. τ. προσευχης, A τ. φωησης.—והשמע אל סקום שבתך אל השמים: the prep. אל with שמע is unique, but in the pregnant sense of 'even unto' is, as Burn. shows, illustrated elsewhere, *e.g.*, 6¹⁸, II. 10¹⁴. Ch. corrected the prep. to כן, and the *Grr.* to ἐν. The objection of some critics (St. and Haupt at length, Šanda) to the adverbial phrase has been commented on above, v.²². On the other hand the unsyntactical השמים, vv.^{32. 34. 36. 45}, and the developed phrase כסון שבתך אל השמים, vv.^{39. 43. 49} (rendered by Ch., *VSS*, *EVV* with 'in/from heaven,' etc.) are to be elided as glosses from the present passage.—31. את אשר: Ch., אם; the prevailing text of Gr. *σα αὐ*, with variant *ως αὐ*, *ος αὐ* (the last interpretation appearing in Heb. MS Ken. 150, rdg. the causative יהיטא).—נשא: so Bär, Ginsb.¹, *BH*; variant נשא, Mich., Ginsb.²; the variants also in the text of Ch. Gr. λαβη=נשא; $\text{\textcircled{T}}$ ירשי, the verb used as tr. of נשא, Dt. 15², and so here='exact against him a curse.' This rdg. is generally preferred; but Akk. *nīšu*, 'oath' (=Heb. root נשא, used of 'lifting up' hands at an oath), suggests that נשא is here much more tenable.—[ובת אלה]: *Grr.*, α. εξαγορευση (verb='to confess,' *e.g.*, Lev. 5⁶); $\text{\textcircled{T}}$ 'and swear himself'= $\text{\textcircled{S}}$, *i.e.*, as for ואלה: $\text{\textcircled{P}}$ 'propter iuramentum.' See Burn. for several revisions proposed; preferable is the rdg. באלה, for which *cf.* Neh. 10³⁰, באים באלה, and so Kamph., St., Šanda, *BH*.—32. השמים: for the word as secondary, also below, see above, v.³⁰.—33. אשר: 10 MSS כי=Ch.; *Grr.*, *οτι*. For the conditional use of the relative particle see Lexx., and C. Gaenssle, *AJSL* 31 (1915), 109 f.—אליך 1⁰: Ch., *OGrr.* om.—אליך 2⁰: Ch.,

לשני; OGrr. om.—35. תענם: so ט ש; Grr., ταπεινωσης αυτους (=EVV), i.e., as תענם (=פ 'propter afflictionem suam'), which is to be accepted, with Then., al.—36. עביר: 6 MSS עביר=Grr., as at vv.^{30. 52}; the sing. to be accepted, with Klost., al.—כי תורם: כי תורם: St. regards as a gloss; yet it may be kept as a parenthesis, like תענם, כי תענ, v.³⁵.—אירץ: ט ד. עקץ, avoiding the provincialism.—37. רעב, רעב: for the rhetorical prefixation of the subject cf. Is. 28¹⁸, Mic. 5⁴, as also later in P (Burn.).—נארץ: 1⁰ נארץ: OGrr. om.—ירקון: OGrr. om.—[שערי] נארץ: with Grr., ש read בָּאָתָר; n.b. פ 'eius portas obsidens'; for the phrase cf. Dt. 12¹⁴, etc.—[כחלה]: n.b. the asyndeton, as also in v.³⁸; some MSS prefix the conj. in both cases.—38. לכל עמך ישראל: OGrr. om.; apparently a restrictive gloss to האדם לכל.—40. פני: MSS 70 94 614 om., and so OGrr.—41. ישראל: MS 70 om., and so ט.—VV.^{41b. 42a} om. by OGrr. by homoiot.—43. אתה: 33 MSS (e.g., 70), Ch., ואתה=Grr., ש.—44. איבו: 2 MSS, Ch., מאיבו=VSS; but the sing. at v.⁴⁶. אל יהוה: Ch., אלך, avoiding the Name; cf. Grr., 'in the name of the Lord.'—46. ואנפת: for the obscure Gr. variants here and in Ch. see Burn.—האיב: MS 70, Ch., OGrr. om.—47. והשיבו: for the phrase, used of careful consideration, see Dt. 4²⁹, 30¹.—שירים: Ch., שָׁקֵם.—[העיון]: 3 MSS, Ch. properly om., and even the Grr. retain the asyndeton.—48. העיר: another case of the frequent asyndeton in this composition; 18 MSS, Ch. with the conj.=Grr., exc. B A i xa₂.—49. משפטם . . . את חלתם: OGrr. om.; a gloss from v.⁴⁵; with Burn., in this case Israel had no legal cause.—52. ליהוה: Ch., יהוה, cf. Grr.—53. For the Gr. transposition of vv. 12^f. to 53^a see Comm. ad loc.—54. קם: perhaps careless grammar; the expected ויקם was read or understood by Grr.—56. יהוה: Grr. + 'to-day'; cf. v.¹⁵.—58. לבנו: some 40 MSS לבנו=the Grr. with pl.—ושפטו: Grr. om., exc. x.—59. ושפט עמי: B al. om. by homoiot.—ביום: Gr. εν ημερα αυτου corrupted in B Z, 5 minuscc. to ενιαυτου.—60. יהוה: κυριος ο θεος, and so ט^L, which omits foll. αυτος θεος.—אין: 30 MSS ואין=Grr., ש פ.—61. לבנבם: Grr., פ 'our heart.'—ללכת: Grr. pref. σσιως.—62. For further textual notes on vv.⁶²⁻⁶⁶ see tr. above.—ישראל עמו: OGrr. as 'יש': cf. MS Ken. 30, העם יש.—63. נבח: OGrr. as pl.—65. After 'before Y. our God' OGrr. insert "in the house which he built, eating and drinking and rejoicing (ט^L+and praising) before the Lord our God," which is perhaps to be accepted, acc. to BH; but this is a superfluous scene.—66. ביום: Grr., ש פ prefix 'and.'—ויברכו את המלך: ט κ. ευλογησεν αυτον; ט^L a doublet of ט and פ (see Rahlfs, SS 3, 193); St. unnecessarily corrects to "and they blessed him"; Benz., on Gr. authority to "and he blessed it (the people)," but the Greeks were ignorant of the use of the Oriental verb.

Ch. 9¹⁻⁹. The second vision to Solomon, of conditional promise and dire threat. || 2 Ch. 7¹¹⁻²² (with long expansion of our v.²). The section is a late postlude to the vision in

3^{5a}. It is thoroughly Deuteronomic in language, is not affected by the Priestly literature. Comm. generally assign it to Exilic or post-Exilic composition. But Burney (with close study of the language, pp. 129-33) and Šanda argue for probable pre-Exilic dating; there is but a brief reference to exile, v. 7^a; cf. Micah's prophecy of the destruction of the holy city, Mic. 3¹². For similar hortatory material cf. David's charge to his son, 2¹⁻⁴, of which there is reminiscence here, vv. 4⁻⁵. 8. Read with correction of \mathfrak{H} : *This house shall become ruins*, as against the absurd *shall become lofty*; for devious evasions of the text cf. EVV; of these JV, on Targumic authority, interestingly introduces the original text by way of a parenthesis: "this house which is so high [shall become desolate]." See Note.

9¹⁰⁻¹⁰. A miscellany: Solomon's buildings, trade, magnificence, cosmopolitan reputation.

9¹⁰⁻¹⁴. Solomon's financial dealings with Hiram. || 2 Ch. 8¹⁻²; cf. *Ant.*, viii, 6, 4.

This brief record must be considerably sifted to obtain a historical residuum. The *twenty years* (v. 10) is evidently sum of the 7 years for building the temple and the 13 for building the palace (6³⁸, 7¹). There remains: 11b. *Then king Solomon gave to Hiram twenty cities in the land of Galilee*; 14. *and Hiram sent to the king 120 talents of gold*. In *JBL* 1934, 49, the writer has argued for the archival character of the adverb 'then' ('āz), occurring in Ki. some thirteen times (e.g., v. 24, q.v.), where the original may have given an exact date. The bargain between the two kings was for a loan to replenish Solomon's empty treasury, for which the latter pawned twenty cantons in Galilee. Šanda endeavours to make exact calculations upon the date of the present transaction, proposing that the Ophir voyage was subsequent, and its profits refilled the treasury, so that the pawned towns could be redeemed; accordingly he accepts the historicity of the parallel in Ch., which speaks of "the cities that Hiram gave to Solomon"; but this is a bald perversion of our passage. Various hypotheses have been offered by critics for v. 14; Grätz arbitrarily changed the statement into "sent the king to H.," i.e., of Solomon's repayment for the pawned cantons; Benzinger makes it a gloss to 'gold,' v. 11. Stade regards the v. as

secondary. For the talent see the Archæologies of Nowack (§37) and Benzinger (§42), Meissner, *Bab. u. Ass.*, I, 356 (with Ass. relief representing the ring-form of the gold specie); for calculations of the value of 120 talents Kittel (1900) proposes an equivalent of 19½ million marks, Šanda (1911) 25 million francs, Meyer (1931) 16 million marks—'but gold of less value than now' (*GA* 2, 2, 264). There is no control of the large figure; cf. the exorbitant figures for gold, 9²⁸, 10^{14ff.}. In the insertion, of good tradition, vv.^{12f.}, is reported Hiram's displeasure at the bargain, when he looked into it; the name of the district, as allegedly given by him, has been, since Josephus's day, generally regarded as a depreciatory nickname, and is explained by a forced interpretation of the Heb. vocable as meaning 'good for nothing' (so Moffatt translates). But the Grr. translate with the word 'boundary,' ὄριον, identifying *kebûl* of \mathfrak{H} with the common word for 'boundary,' *gēbûl*, i.e., 'march-land'; see Note for the quite possible variation between *g* and *k*. Then the verb, generally translated *he called*, is to be rendered *they called*, with impersonal use of the sing. verb (cf. Gen. 16¹⁴, etc.), as Šanda has also argued. A place of the same name, Kebul, in Asher appears at Josh. 19²⁷, known also from Josephus's *Vita*, 43 f., *Χαβαλων*, where he was posted with his troops for a while, the place surviving as Kabul to this day, 8 miles SE of Akko; see Robinson, *LBR* 88; Abel, *GP* 2, 14, 67, 287, the latter scholar suggesting that the name is a survival of the Solomonic term. Accordingly translate: *It was called March-land*. For the ancient address of courtesy between kings, *my brother*, cf. 20^{32f.}.

VV.¹⁵⁻²³. Solomon's levy and the cities that he built. || 2 Ch. 8, 3-10; cf. *Ant.*, viii, 6, 1, 3.

V.^{15a} is introduction to vv.²⁰⁻²³; the insertion, vv.^{15b-19}, the list of cities built, is of original archival type, for which see the writer's "Archival Data in the Book of Kings." But the objective of the passage as a whole is the enslavement of the Canaanites, with contradiction of the notion that Solomon put his own free people to hard labour; compare the democratic criticism of 'the manner of a king' put in Samuel's mouth (1 Sam. 8^{10ff.}), and the actual contradiction of the apology here in the revolt against Solomon's tyrannical administration as described in ch. 12.

15a. *And this is the business of the levy that king Solomon raised to build the house of YHWH and his own house and the Millo and the wall of Jerusalem.* For the organized levy see Comm. on 4⁶. There are abundant testimonies to this brief statement; in **H**, v. 24 *inf.*, 3¹, and **11**^{27b}; in **G** with translations of the Heb. texts, 3¹ being located at end of ch. 4 and with fragments, 2^{35c}. 3^{5eβ}. The presumably oldest form of the present datum is **11**^{27b} (connected with Jeroboam's fortunes): "Solomon built the Millo. He closed up the breach of the City of David his father." This full archivally phrased text remarkably enough appears here in the Hexapla, *e.g.*, A, also **Σ**^π. There was prefixed to this text for sake of completeness the item of "the building of his house and YHWH's house" (so the order in 3¹). There are further echoes of **11**²⁷: for "and the Millo and the wall of Jerusalem" Gr. 2^{35eβ} has simply, "then he built the Akra"; "and the wall of Jerusalem round about" = Gr. 2^{35c}, *cf.* 3¹, "and the wall of Jerusalem." That is, the details of **11**²⁷ are variously reduced and allocated. For the Millo, traditionally identified with the famous Akra of Maccabæan and subsequent ages, see Smith, *Jerusalem*, 2, 40 ff. This identification is regarded as uncertain by Burrows, *WMTS* 66.

The list of cities built by Solomon is interrupted by a pertinent detail of Gezer (v. 16, and the repetition of the name in the opening of v. 17—*v. inf.*); with this omitted, the list reads: **15b.** *and Hasor, and Megiddo, and Gezer, 17. and Lower Beth-horon, 18. and Baalath, and Tamar-in-the-Steppe in the Land.* *Cf.* 2 Ch. 8³⁻⁶, *Ant.*, viii, 6, 1. Reports of the building, rather rebuilding, of cities are innumerable in the Ass. inscriptions. Closer to hand are the similar inscriptions from lands contiguous to Palestine. Mesha of Moab in his stele gives a list of some eight cities which 'I built'; the Syrian stele of Zakar (*ca.* 800 B.C.) records building operations in a broken passage. Indeed the present list may well have been taken from a contemporary royal inscription, and this is equally possible for later references in Kings to city-building. In general, for identification of the cities named see Smith's and Abel's Geographies, Watzinger's *Denkmäler Palästinas*, Galling, *BR*, and for review of earlier opinions Döller, *GES* 160 ff., Šanda, p. 257. *Hasor*, still Israelite at the end of the

Northern kingdom (II. 15²⁹), has only recently been identified, by Garstang in 1926, and as the present Tell el-Ḳedaḥ (not on the Survey Map, but on the recent small Map of the Survey, and that of the Am. Bible Society), 4 miles W of the Jesr Banāt Ya'ḳūb, the bridge across the Jordan, just south of the Ḥuleh Lake; see Garstang, *Liverpool Annals of Archæology and Anthropology*, 14, 35 ff., and the several references to the site by Albright in *BASOR* 29 (1928), 33 (1929), 47 (1932), 68 (1937); to resume Albright: it has an acropolis half again as large in area as Megiddo, was itself a city some eight times as large as Megiddo, was "an important link in the chain of fortified camps, of rectangular form and earthwork defences," on the route of the barbarian irruptions of the 18th century, while traces of rebuilding in the 10th century are to be referred to Solomon's operations. For the recent fruitful excavations at *Megiddo* by the University of Chicago see C. S. Fisher, *The Excavation of Armageddon* (1929); P. L. O. Guy, *New Light from Armageddon* (Or. Inst. Communications, No. 9, 1931);¹ Olmstead, *HPS* 343 f.; Breasted, *The Oriental Institute* (1933), ch. 11; Albright, *APB* 45 ff. There is difference of opinion as to the strata to be referred to Solomon's construction; see Albright in *AJA* 1935, 138; R. S. Lamon, *Megiddo I, Strata I-V* (1939—by personal communication from Dr. R. M. Engberg). Olmstead's and Breasted's volumes, and especially Guy's monograph, give illustrations of the royal stables found at Megiddo, to which constructions v.¹⁹ refers. But now for a later dating of these stables see J. W. Crowfoot, 'Megiddo, A Review,' *JBL* 1940, 132 ff. Such stables have also been found at Tell el-Hesy, Gezer, Taanach (Guy, pp. 42 ff.). For *Gezer* there is Macalister's classical *Excavation of Gezer*, for which cf. Albright, *APB* 25 ff.; excavation there has been renewed by A. Rowe (see the first report in *QS* 1935, 19 ff., with map and 6 plates). For the history of the place see Alt, *JPOS* 1935, 294 ff.; 1937, 218 ff. *Lower Beth-horon* is the defensive post on the road from the Valley of Ajalon to Gibeon, N of Jerusalem, the historical route of advance into the heart of the country from Joshua's day to Allenby's campaign (the latter described in the last edition of Smith's *HG*). *Baalath*

¹ But for final disposal of the current equation of Megiddo and Armageddon, see Comm. II. 23²⁹.

is doubtless the Danite Baalath, not yet identified, grouped with Ajalon, Ekron, Gibbethon, *et al.*, Josh. 19^{41ff.}; *cf. Ant.*, viii, 6, 1. *Tamar* is the city placed by Eze. 47¹⁹, 48²⁸, at the southern boundary of the Holy Land, the Thamara of the *Onomasticon*, now identified with Kurnub, 35 km. SE of Beersheba, and as the *Onomasticon* notes, 'on the route between Elath and Hebron' (see Robinson, *BR* 2, 622, and *cf. Albright, JPOS* 1925, 44 f.). But a romantic identification was early read into the name. In Ch. 8⁴ it is spelled 'Tadmcr,' the item connected with Solomon's operations at Syrian Hamath and Sobah; this reading has been adopted by the Kṛê in our text, and 'Tadmor' appears here in Ⓔ. The illusion was created by the later fame of Tadmor-Palmyra, situated actually 'in the desert above Syria,' as Josephus remarks on the present text. This identification is early indicated in Gr. 2^{46c.} d by pairing together 'the fortresses of the Lebanon and Thodmor [so Ⓔ] in the desert.' ¶ follows with the tr., 'Palmyra.' These Biblical texts were our earliest references to that famous city until Dhorme read the name, Tadmor, in an inscription of Tiglath-pileser I, *ca.* 1100 B.C. (*RB* 1924, 106). An Aramaic inscription, as early as 9 B.C., has been found there (Cooke, *NSI* no. 141). See at large Rostovtzeff, *Caravan Cities* (1932), cc. 4, 5. It may be noted that Forrer, in *RA* 1, 135, regards the reading of Tadmor and so the traditional interpretation as 'durchaus glaubwürdig.' But there is further definition of the place in our text, *in the wilderness, in the land*. This has ever been a crux for translators and commentators (see Notes); various additions have been proposed for 'the land,' and so Kittel (in his *Comm.*) plus 'of Judah,' arguing that identification with Tadmor involved excision of 'Judah.' But the text is fully confirmed by explaining 'in the land' as at 4¹⁹ (*q.v.*), *i.e.*, the native expression for the home-land. The two cases corroborate one another.

The list follows geographical order, and evinces excellent strategical dispositions: Hasor, in the far north near an Upper-Jordan ford; Megiddo, commanding the great hollow between Galilee and the Ephraimite highlands; Gezer, the dower-fief from Pharaoh, on the Philistine border, along with Beth-horon and Baalath controlling the easiest route into the

interior towards Jerusalem ; in the south Tamar, on the route to the Red Sea.

The intruded passage, v.¹⁶, but of original historical authority, reads: *Pharaoh king of Egypt, having gone up and taken Gezer and burned it with fire, and having killed off the Canaanite citizenry* [Heb. *the Canaanite dwelling in the city*], *gave it as dower to his daughter, Solomon's wife.* See Comm., 3¹, for the historical circumstances, also for the Greek attachment of the two verses together and their location at end of ch. 4.²

19. *and all the store-cities of Solomon's* [OGrr. om.], *and the cities for chariots, and the cities for horses* [EVV *horsemen*], *and the pleasure of Solomon, what he was pleased to build in Jerusalem* [om. with OGrr. *and in the Lebanon*] *and in all the land of his dominion.* The v. is identical with 2 Ch. 8^{5b}, the Chronicler having expanded the original and so contaminated the text here, as the Greek omissions prove. The item of chariot cities is supplemented with original details in 10^{26ff.}. The present v. probably expanded a brief termination of the archival list, naming or referring to these depots for the chariots and horses, as in the Zakar stele cited above (Note to 1⁵). As observed there, *horses* is to be read. As for the intrusion from Ch., *and in the Lebanon*, tradition came to include that region in the royal domain on basis of 5²⁸, and also because of the item of the House of the Forest of Lebanon (7², 10²¹). In this connexion is to be noted the cryptic passage in OGrr., 2^{46c}: *καὶ Σαλωμὼν ἤρξατο ἀνοίγειν τὰ δυναστεύματα* [6^l—*τενοντα*] *τοῦ Λιβάνου*; for this see the writer's Note in *JAOS* 1936, 137, interpreting *ἀνοίγειν* in the frequent sense of *bḫ'*, 'to breach, capture,' the following unique noun = 'fortresses,' presenting the object. The passage is thus based on a Hebrew original.

VV.²⁰⁻²³. Resumption of the account of the administration, continuing v.^{15a}, || 2 Ch. 8⁷⁻⁹. The levy, it is alleged (*per contra*, 5^{27ff.}), bore only upon the unexterminated Canaanites, in the language of the Deuteronomists. The Israelites were

² There is supplementally to be noted Albright's article on 'The Gezer Calendar,' in *BASOR* 92 (1943), 16 ff., placing that remarkable relic in Solomon's reign, along with further historical discussion and extensive bibliography.

the royal servants in charge of civil and military administration. Only five of the Canaanite peoples are named as against the classical seven (Dt. 7¹, etc.). The Hex. Gr. interlards the two lacking. For 'Hivites' we have to read throughout the Bible 'Horites,' even as this spelling appears in the Grr. at Gen. 34², Josh. 9⁷.³ The second of the official titles, EVV 'servants,' rather 'ministers' (see at 1²) is properly represented by Gr. *παῖδες*, *i.e.*, 'courtiers'; Ch. omits it, perhaps from democratic objection. The fourth title (EVV 'captains') is etymologically 'thirdling,' that is the third in the royal chariot, along with the king and charioteer, the bearer of the shield and bodyguard, the title then developing into a general court honour; see Meissner, *Bab. u. Ass.*, I, 93. Finally there are *the captains of his chariots and his horses*: the second item belongs to a late age, after the introduction of cavalry. Indeed the whole v. is bombastic and late, as though the Israelites were largely royal officers. V.²³ with introductory *these were* is an awkward termination of the whole period; the verbal phrase may well be omitted. The figure '550' is doubtless authentic; the passage is repeated from the present connexion with the figure multiplied at 5³⁰ (*q.v.*); see Note further.

V.²⁴. Two archival data. *Then (H only) Pharaoh's daughter came up out of the city of David to her house that he built for her. Then he built the Millo.* || 2 Ch. 8¹¹. There is no explanation of the introductory adverb in H, relieved in EVV with 'but,' by Kittel with 'sofort,' etc. Grr. in one place (9⁹) give the solution with 'then' (rdg. 'z instead of 'k), and thus we have two data, without necessary connexion, the adverb in each case representing the original dating in the royal year, as noted above. This datum is the basis of 3¹, "he brought her into David's City, until he finished building his house"; the queen's palace appears in the list of royal constructions (7^{8b}). Ch. presents a gross perversion of the item—the foreign queen might not dwell in David's "holy places" whereas the Oriental lady always has her own 'house.'

³ For the Hurrians-Horites see Speiser, *Mesopotamian Origins* (1930), ch. 5, *in re* Hivites, p. 132; Albright, *SAC* 109 ff. (with recent bibliography). The extent of Hurrian letters appears now in Speiser's 'Introduction to Hurrian,' *AASOR* 20 (1940-41).

25. *And Solomon was wont to offer three times a year holocausts and peace-offerings upon the altar which he built to YHWH, and to burn incense . . . [H with it which—cf. EVV] before YHWH. And he completed the house.* The v. stands by itself; it contains ungrammatical elements. V.^a may be an archival element that has been abused; Kittel would place it after v.²⁸, Šanda after 9⁹; but it should be left with its obscurity in this miscellany. The item may have referred to the time before the completion of the temple, when sacred functions were celebrated by the king at the renewed Davidic altar of 2 Sam. 24²⁵; cf. *sup.* 8⁶³. V.^b, as it is, is a useless repetition; cf. 6¹⁴, etc.

VV.²⁶⁻²⁸. Solomon's enterprise on the Red Sea. || 2 Ch. 8^{17f.}; cf., *Ant.* viii, 6, 4. 26. *And king Solomon made a navy at Esyon-geber, which is beside Eloth, on the shore of the Red Sea, in the land of Edom.* 27. *And Hiram sent in the navy his servants, skippers [Heb. men of ships], who knew the sea, along with the servants of Solomon.* 28. *And they came to Ophir, and fetched from thence gold, 120 [with G; H 420; Ch. 450] talents, and brought it to king Solomon.* This is an authentic record, to be compared with the Egyptian narratives of similar enterprises in that sea. Only the exaggerated figure for the gold is to be corrected. Solomon made use of Phœnician sailors and ship-builders on those distant waters (cf. 'the Tarshish navy with Hiram's navy,' 10²²) in the same way as the Egyptian monarchs from the Old Kingdom down employed Giblete-Byblian (so specifically) seamen in their enterprises in the Red Sea; see P. Montet, *Byblos et l'Égypte* (1928/29), especially pp. 8 ff., 224 ff. For Queen Hatshepsut's famous enterprise to Punt in the first half of the 15th century see Breasted, *ARE* 2, nos. 285 ff., and *HE* 273 ff. (with the frescos depicting the fleet); also on the Biblical relations with that quarter the writer's *Arabia and the Bible*, 175 ff. This sea-trade with Arabia was undertaken in competition with the Arab monopoly of the overland routes, and was resumed by the Persians, Greeks and Romans with the final despoilment of the Arab monopoly. See more at length *Comm.*, 10²². Esyon-geber was the earlier port, hence located as 'hard by Eloth,' which latter name survives as Ayla, near Akaba. Earlier identifications of the place (e.g., by Phythian-Adams, *QS* 1933, 137 ff.,

cf. Montgomery, *op. cit.*, 177, n. 29) have been upset by the brilliant discoveries and excavations made by Nelson Glueck, formerly director of the American School in Jerusalem, who has identified it with Tell el-Kheleifeh, to the west of Akabah, now some 500 metres inland, but earlier situated on the Red Sea. Only summary reference may be made here to Glueck's publications in the *Annual* of the American Schools, vols. 18-19 (1939), and the many current reports in the *Bulletin*, nos. 71-2, 75, 79, 80, 82 (1938-41); his summary accounts in *The Other Side of the Jordan*, in particular cc. 3, 4, and in *Smithsonian Report* for 1941, pp. 453 ff.; also more popular articles in *ILN*, July 30, 1938, in *Asia*, Oct. 1938, Sept. 1939, and *Nat. Geog. Mag.*, 1944, 233 ff. He notes three activities of this ancient 'factory town,' the smelting of the local copper in remarkably devised furnaces, manufacture of copper tools, and ship-building. This was accordingly the storehouse for Solomon's great supply of bronze. The discovery of potsherds with South Arabic lettering exhibits the ancient trade with Arabia. *Cf.* the excellent survey of the region, based mostly on Glueck's results, in Abel, *GP* 2, 35 ff., with a final section on "La route de cuivre dans la 'Araba.'" The discovery of iron deposits and mines in the same region illustrates Dt. 8⁹, and corroborates the tradition of the extensive use of that metal in the temple. No exact location for Ophir has been discovered; it doubtless lay in Arabia, despite extravagant theories; that land once possessed rich deposits of alluvial gold, for which see *Arabia and the Bible*, 38, n. 5, and for Ophir Note below. In earlier literary tradition the present passage may have been associated with 10²², or with the account of Solomon's trade in horses and chariots, 10^{28f.} The passage serves here as preface to the following story of the Queen of Sheba.

1. חֶשֶׁן, חֶפֶן: emendations have been proposed on basis of v.¹⁹ and VSS; see *BH*. The half-verse appears to be dependent upon v.¹⁹, the other buildings of 'Solomon's desire' are not yet listed.—
 3. הַקְרָשָׁי: *Grr.* pref. a plus.—4. אֲחֵהּ: there is no reason, *vs.* St., to elide the word, despite its omission in some pre-Hex. texts.—
 חֶקִי: Ch., חֶקִי=VSS, accepted by St., *BH*, *al.*; but the appositive syntax is correct.—5. עַל יִשְׂרָאֵל: GL 'in Jerusalem'—by historical criticism?—[וְיָרֵךְ] עַל: 23 MSS אֵל, to be accepted; *cf.* 2⁴.—6. אֵם: 2 MSS וְאֵם=Ch., VSS, exc. C .—חֶקִי: 15 MSS חֶקִי=VSS, exc. C ;

to be accepted.—נתיח: Grr., 'Moses gave'; Ⓢ 'I gave to Moses.'—7. הבה: 1 MS, Ch. + היה=Grr.—אשלה: the Piel is supported by Jer. 15¹; Ch. אשליך; for the phrase with the Hif. see II. 13²³, etc.—לכשל ולשניה: the phrase at Dt. 28³⁷, Jer. 24⁹.—8. עליון: =Grr., οψηγος; Ch. expands, אשר היה עליון; Ⓢ preserves ancient reminiscence, "this house which was high shall be desolate" (and so JV exactly); the same adj., הריב, in place of 'ע, appears in Ⓢ and such is the tr. in 12. Read לעין, with Böttcher, *al.* The case is one of alphabetic logomachy; for such alterations see Bleek, *Eintl.*, §270. For the phrase here see Mic. 3¹², Jer. 26¹⁸.—9. ויחוקו באלהים אחרים: the phrase only here and in Ch.; the verb + יחוק as obj. at Is. 64⁹.—וישתחו: many MSS וישתחו, and so the Kṛ.—כל: Ⓢ om.—At end Ⓢ Ⓢ^L a plus from v.²⁴.

10. ויהי סקצה עשרים שנה אשר בנה: "and it came to pass at the end of (the) 20 years that S. took to build," etc. The Heb. is good, does not require correction, as with Klost., St., *al.*, and is to be construed with the period through v.¹¹, v.^{11a} being parenthetical, v.^{11b} apodosis; and so the EVV present with proper parenthesis. OGrr ignored this syntax, and made revision of the opening two words: "in those days [attached to prec. v.]. For 20 years in which S. built the two houses . . . (v.¹¹) H. k. of T. was helping S." Hex. prefixed from Ⓢ "and it was," then followed OGr.—11. נשא: but נשא, 2 Sam. 5¹²; for confusion of נ"ל and ל"ה roots see GK §75, oo. The root is properly נשא/נשא (see GB), with mng. 'to lend'; cf. confusion of similar roots at 8³¹.—12. להם: for the inaccurate gender, presumably arising from the vernacular, see GK §135, o, citing cases in Ruth, Sam., etc.; the same phenomenon appears in Ugaritic and is frequent in OArām. A recent study by M. G. Slonin, 'The Deliberate Substitution of the Masc. for the Fem. Pronominal Suffixes,' *JQR* 32 (1942), lists this use with reference to cities on pp. 149 ff.; a similar case at II. 18¹³.—אין: Grr. om., exc. f m w with a plus, v. *inf.*; Ⓢ^H om. in text, with gloss of rdg. in Aq., Sym.—ככול: Grr., δριον, 'boundary'; Jos. renders with Χαβαλων, proposing a Phœn. mng., οὐκ ἀρεσκον, evidently interpreted as from *ka-bal*, followed by Ewald and successors, as noted above. It is of interest that in his *Vita*, as cited above, Jos. speaks of the place as μεθόριον to Ptolemais, *i.e.*, 'a march-land.' For the identification of the word with *נבל* such a process appears in the Amarna letters, *e.g.*, Kubli for Gubli (Byblos); see F. Böhl, *Sprache der Amarnabriefe* (1909), §7, d. Against the discovery of *bal*, 'nothing,' in the word, it is to be noted that the Grr. read that syllable as *bul*. For other attempts at interpretation see Döllner, *GES* §61. Add to these references the Talmudic citation, Sabb. 54a, where כביל is given the mng. of 'sterility,' with the further remark that "the district was called 'כ' because there were people there who were chained (כבולין) with silver and gold" (Jastrow, *Dict.*, 608b). This explains the gloss in the three Gr. cursives, cited above, γη δουλειας κατα το εβραικον

—14. הַשִׁי: Ⓔ ημεγεκεν, suggesting Hiram's personal conference with Solomon.

15-26. The transpositions and duplicates in Ⓔ (B) are as follows: v. 15. 17b-19. 20-22 = Ⓔ 10²³⁻²⁶; v. 16 = Ⓔ 4³²; v. 17 = Ⓔ 2³⁵¹, 4³³; v. 18 = Ⓔ 2³⁵¹. 4^{6d}; v. 23 = Ⓔ 2^{35h}; v. 24 = Ⓔ 2^{35f}, 9^{9b}. Cf. Montg., 'The Supplement at End of 3 Kingdoms.'—15. רָבַד הַכֶּסֶף: Grr., ηπραγματεια της προνομης; προν. = 'plundering,' and so Ⓔ^H; BH sugg. רבו, as read by the translators (?); Sym., cited in Ⓔ^H tr., understood כֶּסֶף 'tribute.'—הַסְלוֹא: OGrr., τ. ακραν, which Ⓔ^H tr. with *vēšā*, 'the head'; Aquilanic gloss in Ⓔ^H transliterates.—For 'Hasor,' etc., Ⓔ has duplicates, 2³⁵¹.—16. בְּעֵיר הָרָם: Ⓔ εν Μεργαβ = Ⓒ; Ⓔ^L εν Αροεβ.—ים הלש: see Burrows, 'The Basis of Israelite Marriage,' *Am. Oriental Series*, 15 (1938), 41 ff. The word appears in a Ugaritic poem on marriage of gods in Virolleaud's Nikal text (*Syria*, 17, 209 ff.), line 47; cf. Gordon's interpretation, *BASOR* 65 (1937), 29 ff.—17. 'Beth-horon the Lower': Ⓔ, 'B. the Upper'; Ch. has both terms.—18. בְּעֵלָה: Ⓔ om. here, has it at 2³⁵¹, where Tamar is omitted.—תַּרְבִּיךָ: Kr. תִּרְבִּיךָ; and so many MSS Kt = 2 Ch. 8⁴; Ⓔ texts, Θερμαι; Ⓔ^L Θεδ(α)μορ; Ⓔ^H Θερμαθ, but Ⓔ 'Tadmor'; Ⓔ^H 'Palmyra.'—בְּרָבֶר בְּאֶרֶץ: Ⓔ om. בְּאֶרֶץ in both places; Ⓔ 2^{46d} has 'in the desert' = Ch.; Ⓔ^H 'in the desert and in the land,' then omitting the foll. conj., and attaching the second phrase to the foll. v.; Ⓔ^H 'which is in the land, in the desert'; Ⓔ^H 'in terra solitudinis.' These variations indicate the embarrassment of ancient interpreters, followed by modern scholars, e.g., Böttcher + '(land) of Paran'; Kit. + 'of Judah'; Šanda + 'of the Negeb'; see Comm.—19. "and all the store cities of Solomon's": Ⓔ om., Ⓔ^H ✕; possibly an inset from Ch.—סְכָנוֹת: Akk. *maškānu*; see GB, Bezold, *Glossar*, 273.—פִּרְשֵׁי: see above on 1⁵.—תִּשַׁק: many MSS pref. כֵּל = Ⓒ ℒ ℑ ℔, by contamination from Ch.—וּבְלִבְנָן: OGrr. om., an addition by similar process.—סְכָמְלַחוֹ: Grr., του μη καταρξαι αυτου = Ⓔ^H, construed with העם כל, v. 20, as subject, i.e., as though with prefixed כֵּן = לִקְפָּזוֹ—20. Correct B† τον υποδοδειγμενον υπο το τ. υπολελειμενον απο = Ⓒ.—The Grr. have variants for the Canaanite names.—21. לְכֶסֶף עֵבֶר: Ⓔ εις φορον = Ⓔ^H + δουλειας.—22. גֵּבַר: Grr., πραγμα, after Aram. mng. of the root = Ⓔ^H; Aq., 'a doer of service,' i.e., ppl., as at v. 21, which is to be accepted, the sing. being used collectively. Ch. clarifies with לְעֹבְרִים שְׂרָיו וּשְׂלִישֵׁי: Ch., 'שרי ש' ; Ⓔ om.; Ⓔ^L inserts later in the series.—23. שְׂרָיו הַנְּעִיבִים: Grr. as though הַשְּׂרִיִּם תַּוֹּ; the text might well be simplified by omitting the first word, along with preceding אֵלָה, as suggested above.—'550': Ch., '250.'—24. אֵן: Ⓔ^H πλην; at 2³⁵¹. Ⓔ ουτως, by Aram. interpretation (cf. Syr. 'ak, Nöldeke, *Syr. Gr.*, §23, C), but Ⓒ 'then'; in the citation after 9⁹ Ⓔ has τότε, for the doubtless original אֵן, with further defining gloss, εν τ. ημεραις εκειναις. Probably אֵן replaced the awkward אֵן as restrictive particle, "she went up only to her house"; cf. Ch. Also at 9⁹ Ⓔ has 'his house' and 'for himself,' by misreading of suffix ה.—25. וְהִקְשִׁיר אִתּוֹ אִשָּׁר.

לפני יהוה ושלם את הבית : 'beyond translation,' 'conglomeration of marginal glosses,' so St. remarks. The first verb should be read וְהִקְטִיר. The next two words (which S conveniently ignored, and for which S^H has *avros*), Klost., *al.*, would correct to וְשָׂא אֵת, 'his fire-offering,' but, as St. notes, only 'ΥΗΩΗ' is elsewhere so construed with that noun. Apart from the improper consecution of the last verb its mng., 'to finish,' is Aram., not Heb. It may originally have stood alone, continuing the previous verbs, with the sense of 'paying vows' (*cf.* Ps. 76¹²), and then misunderstood, 'the house' was added as object.—26. אֵי : sing. as collective, acc. to Sem. usage, prevalent in Arab., *vs.* the fem. of the unit in the foll. pl. ; *cf.* 22⁴⁹ ; Grr. as sing., but S^H as pl. ; P properly 'classsem.' Grr. + *υπερ ου*, for which Klost. sugg. corruption of *Ωφειρα*.—אלות : MSS אלה, אילה = Grr., with *-at*, as P , II. 14²² ; see Note, 4¹³.—ים סוף : Grr. here exceptionally τ. *εσχάτης θαλάσσης* = S^H , and so = S^H ים סוף, *i.e.*, 'Mare Ultimum,' the Indian Ocean, for which see Montg., *JAOS* 1938, 131 f.—28. אֲפִירָה : Grr. (exc. g e) with initial *sigma*, which is naturally explained as dittog. from prec. [ei]s, and so Rahlfs, *SS* 3, 100. However this spelling is constant in the Sept. as also in Jos., and the new form came to have its own geographical identification ; see W. E. Clark, *AJSL* 36 (1920), 113, who also notes the Gr. 10³⁰ Σωφηρα ορος ανατολων, and Jerome's comment thereon (*PL* 23, 970), 'mons orientis pertinens ad Indiae regionem.' Growing knowledge of the Orient may have identified this 'Sopher' with the Indian port, ancient Suppara, modern Sopāra, near Bombay ; see *Periplus Erythraei Maris*, ch. 52, and Schoff's translation and comments, pp. 43, 197.

10^{1-10. 13}. The visit of the Queen of Sheba. || 2 Ch. 9^{1-9. 12} ; *cf.* *Ant.*, viii, 6, 5 f. The narrative is interrupted by a parenthesis, vv.^{11f.}, an editorial footnote ; see below. The narrative is still regarded by many historians as a legend, so Meyer, *GA* 2, 2, 268 ; Olmstead, *HPS* 341, while Lods and Robinson ignore it. That a Yemenite queen (Josephus makes of her 'a queen of Egypt and Ethiopia') should have travelled some 1400 miles for such a visit is out of question, while the item of Arabian queens has appeared absurd. But the Sabæans were still in North Arabia, had not yet pressed south, although doubtless, like the later Nabatæans, they controlled the northern trade-routes from South Arabia ; they are listed with Massa, Teima, Ephah, all northern tribes, in Gen. 25^{2ff.}, and the tradition of Job makes them neighbours and plunderers of the land of Uz (Job 1¹⁵). Remarkably enough the Assyrian records of the eighth and seventh centuries give the names of

five North Arabian queens, and queens appear in the North Minæan and the late Lihyanian inscriptions; indeed late legend would hardly have invented a queen.¹ Legend has naturally developed about the historical tradition and insisted on the pomp and pride of the royal meeting. In matter of fact sheer diplomacy would have been the object of the queen's visit, politely veiled in the desire to behold the king's glory. Kittel (*GVI* 2, 153) compares the visit of Hittite Hattushil to Ramses II on the occasion of the marriage of his daughter to the latter (Breasted, *HE* 439), although the father's visit is denied by Meyer (*GA* 2, 1, 485). It is of interest, as Meyer observes, that a romantic legend grew up in Egypt about this foreign princess, preserved in a late narrative (*ARE* 3, 429 ff.). For the ancient cosmopolitan interest in wisdom see Comm. above, 5^{9f.}.

3. *And Solomon told her all her questions*: so EVV; but the same verb is translated at Jud. 14¹² with 'declaring' a riddle; rather in modern English, *S. explained all her problems* [Heb. words.] 4. *And the queen of Sheba saw all the wisdom of Solomon, and the house which he built*, etc. 'Wisdom' is used here in the older sense of practical sagacity (see above, on 3^{4ff.}), in particular of Solomon's construction and equipment of his palace (not the temple). 5. The v. nicely delineates the womanly observation of details: *the food of his table, and the seating of his courtiers, and the attendance* [Heb. standing] *of his servants, and his* [with most Grr.; H *their*] *apparel, and his drinking-service* [EVV *cup-bearers*], and *'his holocaust which he was wont to offer in' [?] the house of YHWH*. It is a matter of taste to decide between 'his' and 'their' apparel; the former is preferred by Stade, Šanda, the latter by Kittel; but it is best to preserve the sing. pronoun throughout. Cf. also the word of Jesus on Solomon's array, Mt. 6²⁹. There is question over the word translated *drinking-service*, i.e., the plate for serving wine; but cupbearers were included in the servants. The viniculture of Syria-Palestine was famous from of yore; there may be noted the Egyptian Sinuhe's experi-

¹ See Montg., *Arabia and the Bible*, 58 ff., 180 ff.; Šanda, *ad loc.*, the only commentator who has presented these historical data; also, *in extenso*, Lagrange, *RB* 1902, 256 ff.; 1927, 597, and Hommel, *EGAO* 142 ff., and his treatment of Sabæan history in Nielsen, *HAA* 65, 75.

ences (ca. 1970 B.C.) in Syria, declaring that there " wine was more plentiful than water " (Gressmann, *ATB* 1, 56 ; Barton, *AB* 372). The Ras Shamra texts constantly refer to wine and wine-cups, e.g., the luscious scene in the introduction to the Anat Poem. 1 Ch. 27²⁷ records the wine-cellars attributed to David's *ménage*. The climax of marvels was, according to the common modern translation, the great holocausts of the king, the spectacular ritual, as it were fascinating the woman's eye. But Ch. gives a variation of spelling for the critical word, and the change induced here the usual translation (GV FV EVV, exc. JV), ' his ascent by which he went up into —,' following Jewish tradition and comm. This ' ascent ' was identified by the rabbis with ' the ascending causeway ' of 1 Ch. 26¹⁶ (see Lightfoot, ' Descriptio templi ' in his *Opera*, 1, 559 ; cf. Keil) ; but why this architectural item should have been selected is not obvious. With slight change of 𐤃 here we can obtain *his going up by which he ascended to YHWH's house*, and the reference would then be to the great processions ; cf. the Psalms of Ascent. *And there was no more spirit in her* : so EVV ; but following the original physical meaning of the Heb. noun, she ' was left breathless ' by her amazement. 6. EVV, *concerning thy acts and concerning thy wisdom* : but read with Grr., *concerning thee*, etc. 7. Heb., *thou hast added wisdom and goodness to the fame that I heard* : OGrr. lack ' wisdom and,' Ch. om. ' and goodness.' What is meant by the latter word is not at all clear, as the variety of trr. exhibits : Grr., ἀγαθά, 𐤃 ' opera,' EVV ' prosperity.' It does not mean ethical goodness in the modern English sense ; it might mean liberality, but this royal characteristic is presented below. The sentence may possibly be translated, following OGrr., with *thou hast added much to the fame which I heard* (see Note). 8. *Happy thy men !* : but this is redundant along with the following congratulation of the courtiers ; the Grr. have *thy wives* (i.e., nšyk for 'nšyk), followed by $\text{𐤃}^{\text{H}} \text{𐤃} \text{𐤀}$, and this correction is to be accepted with modern commentators in general ; here again a case of feminine psychology. Prof. P. K. Hitti has informed the writer that it is good Oriental etiquette for a lady to ask after a gentleman's wife, not for a gentleman to do so. But to later moralizing those wives of Solomon's were a *bête noire*, cf. ch. 11. 13a. EVV,

And king Solomon gave to the queen of Sheba all her desire, whatsoever she asked, beside that which Solomon gave her of his royal bounty. But the English tries to improve upon the Heb., which reads, *apart from what he gave her according to the hand of king Solomon*. This awkward sentence is to be relieved by omitting with some Gr. MSS and most VSS the final *Solomon*, with the resultant *by royal bounty*, even as the phrase is used at Est. 1⁷, 2¹⁸. *All her desire* has been romantically interpreted by Jewish legend as of the queen's desire for offspring by Solomon, and so Rashi comments: "He went in unto her, and there was born of her Nebuchadnezzar."²

VV.^{11.12}. Solomon's imports from the Red Sea. || 2 Ch. 9^{10.11}; cf. *Ant.*, viii, 7, 1. This interpolation in the above story is independent of the other two similar notes, 9²⁶⁻²⁸, and *infra*, v.²², all of them indeed independent. 11. *Hiram's navy* is specified as Phœnician even more exactly than at 9^{26f.}; Ch. relieves the notion of alien control by substituting 'the servants of H. and of S.' The *almug timbers* (so pl. in \mathfrak{H}) remain a mystery as to botanical identity and origin. Ch. has 'algum'; Grr. vary between two contradictory words, 'plane' and 'unplaned' (wood); Jos. makes it a pine-wood; Sym. and \mathfrak{H} translate with 'thyina,' a N. African wood used for fine furniture; Aquila identifies with amber, the Talmud with red coral (Jastrow, *Dict.*). Since the botanist Celsus (1748) the identification with Indian sandalwood has become common, and has been adopted by JV—this supported by alleged etymology from Sanskrit 'valgu'; but see the Sanskritist W. E. Clark's full discussion of 'The Sandalwood and Peacocks of Ophir,' *AJSL* 36 (1920), 103 ff., dismissing as wholly unproved any Indian etymology. An ingenious suggestion, presented by Šanda, identifies the word with Egyptian

² For the Jewish development of the story and the riddles the queen put to the king see Targum 2 to Esther, ch. 2; Fabricius, *Codex Pseudepigraphicus*, 1013 ff.; Ginzberg, *Legends of the Jews*, vol. 4; for the Ethiopic saga of the descent of the Abyssinian dynasty from the union of the couple, Budge, *The Queen of Sheba* (1922). For the Arabic romance of the Bilkis legend (so the lady is named), in which Solomon's answer to the riddle she proposed to him converted her to the true religion, see the text in the Chrestomathy of Socin's *Arabic Grammar* (1922), and cf. Rosch, *JPT* 6, 544 ff. For comparative stories see Frazer, *Folklore in the O.T.*, 2, ch. 10.

kmy, which he finds in Herodotus's word *κόμμι* (ii, 96), then supposing that the initial syllable is the Arabic article, thus approving the spelling of Ch. ; however, Herodotus merely states that the sap of the wood in question (*ἀκάνθη*, *Mimosa Nilotica*, still used for ship-building in Egypt) is *κόμμι*, *i.e.*, gum ; see also Albright, *AJSL* 37 (1921), 144 f. ; 39 (1922), 31. 12. The word translated *pillars* in EVV (but the Heb. word is sing.), following the VSS, 'supports,' on the basis of the Heb. root, is unknown for its technical mng. ; Ch. appears to have guessed at it with 'highways' = EVV 'terraces,' JV 'paths.' The further reference to the use of the wood for musical instruments shows that it was of delicate nature, used perhaps for inlay, wainscotting.

VV.¹⁴⁻²⁹. This section is a compilation of *membra disjecta*, following clues in the story of the Queen of Sheba's visit. VV.¹⁴⁻²⁵ accumulate the items of Solomon's wealth and magnificence ; vv.^{14, 15} state his yearly income in taxes and customs duties ; vv.^{16, 17} describe the honorific golden shields in his palace, and vv.¹⁸⁻²⁰ his throne of ivory and gold—the latter two sections having early documentary basis ; v.²¹ is an exaggerated item on the golden service in the palace, which induces, v.²², citation from a source parallel to 9²⁶⁻²⁸, 10¹¹, relating to his imports by sea ; vv.²³⁻²⁵ are a summary climax on his wisdom and wealth. Finally there is a postscript, vv.²⁶⁻²⁹, concerning his accumulation of chariots and horses, parallel to 5⁶ ; the interpolated v.²⁷, a commonplace upon his wealth, intruded from Ch., is followed by a record of his trading in horses and chariots, also of ancient origin. The materials have been loosely shuffled about, recalling the two *pots pourris* in Gr. 2^{35a} seq., 46^a seq. Cf. a brief Note by the writer in *JBL* 1931, 115 f.

VV.^{14, 15}. Solomon's income. || 2 Ch. 9^{13, 14} ; cf. *Ant.*, viii, 7, 2. After the interlude of the Queen of Sheba's visit the register of Solomon's wealth and glory is resumed. For the meagre details we possess of the royal budget see Bertholet, *History of Heb. Civilization*, 249 ff., and Lurje, *Studien*, 27 ff. The enormous figure of 666 talents gold for yearly royal income is a late exaggeration ; the sum may have been reached approximately, with Šanda, by adding the previous figures for gold, at 9^{14, 28}, 10¹⁰. On the other hand the comparatively

petty item of v.^{15a}, the taxes on the traders, may well be an early note, and possibly was a postscript to ch. 9. But v.^{15b} appears to be late, lamely introducing the tribute of kings and satraps after the merchants and pedlars, a criticism supported by the use of the Akk. word for *satraps* (as the Gr. translates it here, EVV *governors*), a word however early domesticated in Syria, being put in Syrian mouths at 20²⁴. The difficulty in the brief phrase of v.^{15a} is glossed over in the translations, e.g., JV, *beside that which came of the merchants and of the traffic of the traders*; but the Heb. for the first noun is the impossible *men of the merchants*; the text is clarified by the Grr., which read or understood 'nšy for 'nšy, with the resultant *taxes of the merchants*. In the later addition, v.^{15b}, the current *kings of the mixed people* (RVV JV) must be replaced with *kings of Arabia* (or better *the Arabs*), with Aquila, Sym., and so AV here. On the general correction of the Heb. word, with one possible exception, Ex. 12³⁸, see *Arabia and the Bible*, 29, n.⁵. The reference to taxation of international merchandizing is of interest as probably the earliest record of the kind that we possess. Such excises were highly developed in the ancient Orient; the factor entered into the appreciation of Indian wares, which reached Rome at one hundred times their original cost according to Pliny, *NH*, vi, 26. For later local *octrois* of this nature is to be compared the Palmyrene Tariff (Cooke, *NSI* no. 147, with parallel texts listed, p. 332). The history of the Crusades presents the flourishing and profitable character of this method of taxation.

VV.^{16. 17}. The golden shields. || 2 Ch. 9^{15. 16}; cf. *Ant.*, viii, 7, 2. Two patterns of shield are denoted: the first (*šinnāh*) the long shield proper, covering the length of the body, and the small round shield (*māgēn*); AV RV JV call the former 'target,' RV^{Am} 'buckler,' which is preferable, and they agree for the latter word with 'shield'; but the two terms of the English should be exchanged, and so below. For these varieties of shields see Rawlinson, *Five Great Monarchies*, I, 428 ff.; Meissner, *Bab. u. Ass.*, I, 96 f. As appears from the later reference to these shields upon Shishak's looting of the palace (14^{26ff.}), and their replacement by Rehoboam with bronze shields to be worn by the guard when the king went into the house of YHWH, these shields were of honorific use; they might

be compared with the chivalric shields hung in chapels of the knightly orders, as here they are hung in the Lebanon Palace. But they were also carried pompously into battle, as a list of David's booty shows (2 Sam. 8⁷). The word translated *beaten* [gold] in EVV, *i.e.*, *hammered*, refers to gold inlay and overlay; the shields were not of solid gold. The figures differ in the textual authorities. For the 200 shields of \mathfrak{H} (=Jos.), Grr. have 300. Šanda observes that according to 2 Sam. 15¹⁸ David's bodyguard numbered 600 men, and this may well account for the higher figure of the Greek, *i.e.*, 300 shields + 300 bucklers = 600 in all. To each shield was applied 600 (shekels) gold, the denomination being omitted as frequently, *e.g.*, Gen. 24²²; to each buckler *three minas gold*, for which Ch. has '300 (shekels) gold'; the mina then containing 60 shekels, thus giving a figure two-thirds larger than Ki.; the denomination in minas here is remarkable. Also the Grr. have for the gold value of the shield 300 shekels *vs.* 600 of \mathfrak{H} . Šanda has attempted calculation of the value of the gold, as at 4,000,000 francs (value as of the year 1911); but the figures are historically most dubious.

VV.¹⁸⁻²⁰. The gold and ivory throne. || 2 Ch. 9¹⁷⁻¹⁹; *cf.* *Ant.*, viii, 5, 2. With this description is to be compared that of Ashurbanipal's throne; see Luckenbill, *ARA* 2, §§1012-14; Meissner, *Bab. u. Ass.*, 2, cuts 117, 118. 18. For the problematic word, translated *pure* (gold), see Note. 19. \mathfrak{H} and the top of the throne was round(ed) behind = EVV; this is to be corrected with the Grr.: *and the throne had a calf's head at its back*. The Masoretic pointing changed the original word, doubtless to get rid of unhappy associations with the calf, as in the case of Aaron and the people (Ex. 32), and of Jeroboam (*inf.* 12^{26ff.}). Ch. replaced the word with the less objectionable 'lamb,' which an arbitrary change of pointing in most MSS and edd. changed into 'footstool'; see Note. The lamb had its vogue in ancient art; Meissner, I, 248, gives a cut of a 'Prunkstuhl' decorated with lambs' heads, and Šanda cites the throne of a seated Baal flanked with lambs (from Frohnmeyer-Benzinger, *Bilderatlas*, 129). *There were six steps to the throne*: this structure, with a seventh level for the dais, has been well compared with the seven levels of Babylonian cosmogony and the seven stories of Babylonian temples (A. Wünsche,

Salomos Thron u. Hippodrom, 1906; Gressmann, *Die älteste Geschichtsschreibung u. Prophetie Israels*, 219; C. R. North, *ZAW* 1932, 28). 19. 20. *And there were arms [EVV stays] on either side of the place of the seat, And there were two lions standing beside the arms, and twelve lions standing 'there' [OGrr. om.] on the one side and on the other upon the six steps.* The lion was type of royal strength, possibly once the totem of Judah; cf. Gen. 49⁹, Rev. 5⁵; but it was a common theme in such art. There is the early occurrence of stone lions at Tell Ḥalaf; see von Oppenheim, pp. 85 ff., with plates. Bronze lions were frequent in Syrian art (Dussaud, *SAM* plates 19, 23), and Parrot has recently discovered at Mari bronze lions, 'of menacing attitude' (*Syria*, 1938, pt. 1, pl. x; *ILN*, May 28, 1938). Sennacherib proudly describes the bronze lion-colossi furnishing his palace (*ARA* 2, §§367, 391). The sphinx appears on either side of the throne of Hiram of Tyre (Dussaud, pl. 7). This ivory and gold throne is abundantly illustrated from ancient sources. Ashur-nasir-pal of Assyria received from an Aramæan king, Ammibaal, 'ivory couches overlaid with gold' (*KB* 1, 92; *ARA* 1, §466); Hezekiah of Judah sent to Sennacherib beds and chairs of ivory (see Comm. on II. 18^{14b}). See further Comm. on 22^{39f}. for the recent marvellous finds of ivory at Megiddo, Samaria, and elsewhere. Ivory was well into the first millennium B.C. a product of the North Syrian lands, where the elephant still roamed. Thutmose II received tribute of elephants from Syria, and Thutmose III took part in a hunt of 120 elephants near the upper Euphrates (Breasted, *HE* 271, 304). Tiglath-pileser I hunted and captured elephants in Mitanni-land (*ARA* 1, §247); elephants are portrayed on Shalmaneser III's Black Obelisk (cf. Meissner, *Bab. u. Ass.*, 2, 270, 273, 326). For the ancient wide distribution of the Asiatic elephant see C. W. Bishop, 'The Elephant and its Ivory in Ancient China,' *JAOS* 1921, 290 ff. But v.²² with its reference to ivory importation from the Red Sea, suggests another quarter for the supply. This description of the throne is doubtless authentic, based, as its simple terms suggest, upon an early document. For the later marvellous Jewish legends about this throne, with its wonderful mechanical equipment, see Targum 2 to Esther, ch. 2, Ginzberg, *Legends*, and Wünsche, cited above.

V.²¹, on Solomon's all-gold service vessels, is a late exaggeration indeed.

V.²². The source of Solomon's gold and silver and other exotic imports. || 2 Ch. 9²¹; cf. *Ant.*, viii, 7, 2, 3. The v. is parallel to 9²⁶⁻²⁸, 10¹¹, but of different content. The earlier authentic references to Hiram's fleet are augmented here with *the king's Tarshish fleet along with Hiram's fleet*; this statement suggests a free port for both parties. For the term 'Tarshish fleet' used of ships in waters of the Indian Ocean cf. the term 'Hittite,' i.e., Phœnician, used by Sennacherib for the fleet built for his operations in the Persian Gulf by Phœnicians, and manned by 'Tyrians, Sidonians, Ionians (?)' (*ARA* 2, §§319, 329, 350); cf. Olmstead, *HA* 200, and Hall, *AHNE*³ 488, with accompanying plate from an Assyrian monument depicting such a ship with its oarsmen in action.³ *Once in three years the Tarshish fleet would come in* (to port). L. Woolley, in his *Abraham* (1936), p. 121, sums up a still unpublished document from Babylonian Ur, reporting a voyage

³ Tarshish has generally been identified with Classical Tartessos on the Guadalquivir, N. of Cádiz, on the Atlantic front; see A. Schulten, *Tartessos* (1922); Meyer, *GA* 2, 2, 94 ff. (in his chapter on the Phœnicians, pp. 61-136); A. Herrmann, *Die Erdkarte der Urbibel*, with an Appendix on Tartessos; Tozer, *History of Ancient Geography*, Add. Note, p. iv. Schulten's very high dating for the founding of the colony is sharply criticized by Meyer, p. 105, n. 2, the latter dating the event in the 11th century. P. Bosch-Gimpera dates it as not much earlier than the 8th century, *Klio* 22 (1929), 345 ff., with reply by Schulten, *ib.*, 284 ff.; Albright's dating, as cited below, is ca. 950. The place-name appears on an alabaster tablet of Esarhaddon's, with correction of previously read 'Nusisi,' in *ARA* 2, §710; see Meyer, p. 102, n. 2. The place is aligned with Cyprus and Yawan (Greece) as subject to the royal power. Also in another text of Esarhaddon's (§690) Carthage is named. The Grr. translate the word with 'Carthage' at Is. 23⁶, Eze. 27¹². C has here 'an African ship.' Ch. has the fleet sailing to Tarshish. Josephus with his 'Tarsian sea' identified the place with Tarsos. The most trenchant fresh point in archæology is Albright's definite reading of the initial line of a stone inscription from ancient Nora in Sardinia (*CIS* I, 144; Cooke, *NSI*, no. 41): *btšš . . . šdn*, in Tarshish . . . Sardinia.' See his presentation, with fresh translation of the text, in *BASOR* 83 (1941), 14 ff., and his further discussion at large in the Leland Volume, pp. 41 f. He derives the noun from Akk. *rašāšu*, 'to melt,' with a parallel Arabic root, and holds that the term means a refinery and in the inscription refers to a local smelting-place.

of two years from and back to that harbour. (The writer owes the following citation to the kindness of Professor Albright.) "We have the bill of lading of one such (ship) that in *circa* 2040 B.C. [Albright corrects to *ca.* 1830] had come up from the Persian Gulf after a cruise of two years; it brought copper ore and gold and ivory, hard woods for the cabinet-maker, diorite and alabaster for the sculptor's workshop. Not all of these things would have come from the shores of the Gulf itself, but from much farther afield, carried in foreign vessels to be transhipped in the Gulf ports." He mentions in particular lapis lazuli, brought *via* Persia from the Pamir mountains. If commerce as far as India is to be found in the Biblical passage, the round voyage, with many transshipments, in the third year is most reasonable. For the Indian voyages in a later age see W. H. Schoff, *The Periplus of the Erythraean Sea*, with its valuable notes. In the present case the products brought back, in addition to gold and silver, were *ivory and apes and peacocks*, according to current translations, based on the VSS subsequent to the OGrr., the latter having for the three terms only two, 'stones carved and cut' (?). Jos. presents 'much ivory, Ethiopians and apes.' The word here and in Ch. for 'ivory' is unique; it means 'elephant-tooth.' The following two words are now to be interpreted as of ape-species, for convenience of translation as *apes and baboons*; see Albright, *AJSL* 37 (1921), 144. In a personal communication the same scholar notes the use of Egyptian originals of these two words as occurring together among the rarities that the Tale of the Shipwrecked Sailor reports as brought home from the voyage (Erman, *Lit. Anc. Egyptians*, 34). A species of baboon still exists in the Yemen and Hadhramaut (G. W. Bury, *Arabia Infelix* [1914], 27 f.; British Admiralty's *Handbook of Arabia*, 227). Monkeys from Punt, Somaliland, were a favourite import *de luxe* into Egypt, e.g., the report on Hatshepsut's Red Sea expedition (*ARE* 2, §265; Breasted, *HE* 276). The like zoological interest appears in an Assyrian monarch. Ashur-nasir-pal tells of his capture and caging of divers wild animals, including the elephant, and sending them to his capital; and a relief represents the bringing of tribute of monkeys to him (*ARA* 1, §519; Olmstead, *HA* 95, and fig. 59). See at large W. C. McDermott,

The Ape in Antiquity (Baltimore, 1938). No etymological corroboration of the traditional translation 'peacocks,' an Indian bird, has been found; see Clark's article cited above on vv.^{11, 12}. For importation of foreign birds by Assyrian monarchs see Meissner, *Bab. u. Ass.*, I, 223, 353 (with a possible reference to the peacock), and *in extenso* Albright and Dumont, *JAOS* 1934, 108 f. W. F. Badè, discussing a seal representing 'an exquisitely carved cock,' found at Tell en-Nasbeh, of date ca. 600 B.C., suggests, following Maisler, that also the word in our passage refers to this only late domesticated fowl, and so Albright, *loc. cit.* For importation of the peacock into the West see E. H. Warmington, *Commerce between the Roman Empire and India* (1928), 147, 152. But proof of Israelite trade with India is not demonstrated by our text.

VV.²³⁻²⁵. The fame of Solomon's wealth and wisdom beyond all the kings of the earth, and how all the world attended upon him to hear his divine wisdom, bringing their respective annual tributes. || 2 Ch. 9²²⁻²⁴; *cf. Ant.*, viii, 7, 3. *Cf.* 5^{9ff.}, with here superabundant exaggeration, e.g., *all the world*, and *each one his tribute, by rate year by year*—'tribute' as the context requires, not 'present' with EVV. V.²⁵ appears to be phrased after the pompous lists of booty in Ass. inscriptions; e.g., a text of Tiglath-pileser III: "Tribute of . . . (named kings of Syria and Arabia), gold, silver, lead, iron, elephants' hides, ivory . . . garments . . . lambs . . . winged birds . . . horses, mules, cattle, sheep, camels, she-camels with their young I received" (*ARA* I, §772; Rogers, *CP* 316; Barton, *AB* 464). A more limited parallel appears in the report of the author of the *Periplus* of the tribute rendered to the Arabian king of Muza: "horses and sumpter-mules, vessels of gold and polished silver, finely woven clothing and copper vessels" (Schoff's tr., §24). The word currently translated for one of the gifts as *armour* should be rendered *myrrh*, or *stacte* with the Grr.; for this reading see Note, and for that valuable commodity in ancient trade Schoff, pp. 112 ff.

VV.²⁶⁻²⁹. Solomon's chariotry and horses, and his trade in horses and chariots. || 2 Ch. 1^{16, 17}, with duplicate, 9²⁵⁻²⁸; *cf. Ant.*, viii, 7, 3, 4. V.²⁷ is a late intrusion on the cheapness of silver (*cf.* v.²¹) and cedar in the realm, probably introduced from Ch. 26. *And Solomon collected chariotry and horses, and*

he had 1400 chariots and 12,000 horses, which he stationed in the chariot cities and 'in the royal quarters' [Heb. *with the king*] in Jerusalem. See Note on 1⁵ for the word generally translated *horsemen*; horsemen were not deposited as though in barracks in the chariot cities. The figure for chariots, 1400, is expanded in 5⁶ to '40,000 horse-stalls,' while the figure in Ch. 9²⁵ is 4000. Ⓔ (B₂) here also has 4000, which is expanded by all other MSS and S^{II} to 40,000, and so the figure in Gr. 2⁴⁶¹; Jos. discovered 22,000 horses. These are classic instances of the expansion of numerals in text-tradition. For 'stables' the Grr. have a novel interpretation, 'mares' (see Note). The figure of 1400 chariots—not a round number—is quite credible. Ancient tradition reports 900 chariots for Sisera (Jud. 4³); Shalmaneser III records for his invasion of Syria in 854 B.C. booty of 1200 chariots from Ben-Hadad of Damascus, 700 from Hamath, 2000 from Ahab the Israelite (ARA 1, §611, CP 295 f., AB 458), and for his invasion twelve years later booty of 1121 chariots of Hazael (ARA §663, CP 303, AB 459). Royal stables in definite chariot cities are now brilliantly confirmed and illustrated by the University of Chicago's expedition at Megiddo, with the uncovering of stabling for some 400 horses; see Comm., 9¹⁵ (where, however, the present doubt as to their Solomonic construction is cited). For traces of stables at Tell el-Hesy and Beth-shean see Watzinger, DP 1, 87 f. Šanda notes that Jos. 19⁵ lists along with Ziklag two places called Chariot-House and Mare-Court, which may go back to Solomon's foundations. There may be noted Josephus's report, however extravagant, of the fine stone roads laid out by Solomon, and of his frequent excursions with a brilliant knightly party to Ethan, 50 furlongs distant, a paradise of waters, probably the earliest reference to the Pools of Solomon, 8 miles S of Jerusalem.

28. *And for the export (=import) of the horses for Solomon from Musri* [Ⓔ Misraim-Egypt] *and 'from Kue'* [with Grr., Ⓜ] *the royal traders would bring them 'from Kue'* [with Grr., Ⓜ] *at a (fixed) price.* 29. *And a chariot came up by export (lit., and came out) from Musri* [Ⓔ Misraim] *at six hundred* [Grr., a hundred] *(shekel-weight) silver, and a horse at one hundred and fifty* [Grr., fifty], *and so for all the kings of the Hittites and the kings of Syria, making export (=import) through their agency.*

Even with certain corrections of text the whole passage reads roughly, much like a business memorandum. The Grr. and \mathfrak{P} have preserved a true and interesting item, first identified by Lenormant (*Histoire ancienne*, 3, 9), namely the ancient trade-relations with Kue, *i.e.*, Cilicia. The trouble the word has given to translators appears in modern VSS: GV 'allerlei' (from the mng. of the Heb. word as 'collection'); FV 'fil'; Tremellius and Junius, 'netum' (yarn), and so AV, 'linen yarn'; these following Rashi, Kimchi, with reference to the fine linen of Egypt; RVV 'droves'; finally JV 'from Keveh,' and Moffatt and Chic. B., 'from Kue'; see Note. Further, Winckler brilliantly identified at least the first 'Misraim' with the land of Musri, the later Cappadocia, lying N of the Taurus; and later the kings of Musri, with same correction of \mathfrak{H} , appear as confederates of the invading Hittites, II. 7⁶. These two lands are known from the Ass. inscriptions, and in one case are named together, in Shalmaneser III's Monolith Inscription (col. ii, 92; *ARA* 1, §611, *CP* 296, *AB* 458); see Winckler, *KAT* 238, for his early discussion. And now Kue appears as one of the allies of Ben-Hadad of Damascus against Zakar of Hamath in the latter's 8th-century inscription, and the other name, M \mathfrak{S} r, occurs in the Aramaic S \mathfrak{U} j \mathfrak{I} n text (*ca.* 755 B.C., line 5 of tablet 1; Bauer's ed., pp. 1 ff., with literature on Musri, p. 10). For the location of these lands see S. Smith, *Early History of Assyria*, 262, 389; *CAH* 3, 357, 474; also for Musri *cf.* Alt, *ZDMG* 1934, 255, n. 1. Thus two new names of district and folk have been added to the Hebrew lexicon. Anatolia, the land of *all the kings of the Hittites* (for which people see Comm., II. 7⁶) and in particular Musri were lands of horse-breeding, as has been known from the Amarna letters and subsequent Ass. texts at length, with which are to be compared Eze. 27¹⁴, 38^{3ff.} 4. The early intensity of Anatolian horse-breeding is exhibited in the Hittite text on horse-training published by

⁴ See Meissner, *Bab. u. Ass.*, 1, 217 ff.; *CAH* 3, 256; Meyer, *GA* 1, 2, §§455, 577 (note his denial, p. xx, of the horse as ridden by the Indogermans); Olmstead, *HA*, Index, *s.v.*; A. Götze, *Hethiter, Churriter u. Assyrer* (1936), Index, *s.v.* 'Pferd'; Galling, *BR* 'Pferd (u. Wagen),' with statement that the ridden horse did not appear in Assyria until the 8th century. See also Note on 1⁶.

Hrozný, *Arch. Or.*, 3 (1931), 431 ff., and the extension of the industry into Syria is now shown by the Ugaritic veterinary treatise (14th century), published by Virolleaud (*Syria*, 1934, 75 ff.). A problem arises whether the second 'Misraim' should also be corrected to 'Musri,' with Winckler, Kittel, Skinner, Moffatt, Chic. B., and Šanda after lengthy discussion. With 𐤎 preserved here we have detail of international exchange of Anatolian horses and Egyptian-made chariots. This is an attractive hypothesis with its prospect of ancient trade, and might be supported by Breasted, who after stating the introduction of the horse into Egypt by the Hyksos (*HE* 222), speaks of the Egyptians as subsequently becoming deft chariot-makers, and presents plate of an Egyptian chariot that has been preserved, now in the Florence Museum (pp. 234 f., fig. 105). But this position is denied by Meyer (*GA* 2, 1, 23, n. 2) with the proof that the wood is not Egyptian. Solomon then would have been the middleman for import of both horses and chariots from Anatolia into Egypt. The horse indeed came to be domesticated in Egypt at a later day; cf. Dt. 17¹⁶, Is. 31^{1ff.}, and Egypt rendered tribute of horses to Sargon and Ashurbanipal (Olmstead, *HA* 383, 416). For the comparative prices of chariot and horse, the Gr. give the ratio of 2 : 1 as against 4 : 1 of Heb.; see Šanda's discussion, citing the price of an ass in Cambyses' time at 50 shekels; the Gr. figures are probably a correction to meet later proportions of value. For the shekel see *DB* 'Money'; *EB* 'Shekel'; Nowack, *Arch.*, 1, 209 ff.; Benzinger, *Arch.*, §42; Galling, *BR* 'Geld,' with added bibliography.

1. לְשֹׁמֵר : om. with Ch.; added *ad majorem gloriam Dei*; the Gr. helped out the awkward phrase with 'and the name of the Lord.'—2. וְגַמְלִים : the asyndeton, relieved in Ch. and Gr. (exc. 44) with the conj., is correct.— שְׁלֵמָה : MSS pref. וְהַמֶּלֶךְ , and similar variations occur below in VSS in use of name and title.—5. שֵׁלֶחָו : Gr. as שְׁלֵמָה .— מִלְבוּשֵׁיהֶם : =Ch., Jos., 4 Gr. MSS; other Gr. as מִלְבוּשָׁו .— מִשְׁקֵיוֹ : Ch. + וּמִלְבוּשֵׁיהֶם , interpreting as 'his cupbearers' = Gr. οἰνοχοοὺς ($\text{Ἐ}^{\text{L}} \text{εἰνοχοῦς}$) = $\text{Ⓣ} \text{Ⓢ} \text{Ⓜ}$; but it means the 'drinking service' (cf. Gen. 40²¹), with variant spelling of suff.; see GK §93, ss.— עֲלֵהוּ : =Gr.; $\text{Ⓣ} \text{Ⓢ} \text{Ⓜ}$ as pl., which St., *BH*, *al.* accept; Ch., עֲלֵהוּ , understood as 'ascent,' and so here the Jewish comm.; but עֲלֵהוּ otherwise = 'upper story.' The word can be pointed עֲלֵהוּ , 'his going up'; cf. Comm.— הִיא : . . . רוּחַ : Haupt properly defends the gender of the verb, as preceding the subj.—6. הִיא : Ch., Gr.

om., and so St., *al.*; but it has force = 'has become.'—[על] רברר: 1 MS רברר=Grr., to be accepted; for 'על ר' = 'on account of' *cf.* 2 Sam. 18⁶.—7. לרבים: Grr., $\text{Ⓢ} \text{Ⓟ}$ as ppl.—[הכמה] [טוב]: $\text{Ⓢ} \text{Ⓢ}^{\text{L}}$ om. —וטוב: Ch. om.; for possible adverbial sense of 'ט' *cf.* Aram. טב.—אל: MSS and Ch., על, to be accepted.—[השמות]: Grr. pref. 'all,' as though כל, as also before הכמתן, v.⁸, and Ⓢ before עבירה, v.¹³; but such addition is exaggeration.—[שמעתי]: Grr. + 'in my land.'—8. אנשי: =Ch., $\text{Ⓢ} \text{Ⓟ}$; Grr., $\text{Ⓢ}^{\text{H}} \text{Ⓢ} \text{Ⓜ} = \text{Ⓢ}^{\text{H}} \text{Ⓢ} \text{Ⓜ}$, and so most moderns since Böttcher.—9. ל'עלם: *i.e.*, the divinely appointed dynasty is sign of the divine 'love' 'for ever.' Ch. pref. להעמיד, *cf.* $\text{Ⓢ} \text{Ⓢ}^{\text{L}}$ $\text{Ⓢ} \text{Ⓢ}^{\text{L}}$ = Ⓢ^{L} + *αυτον*, but the incomplete $\text{Ⓢ} \text{Ⓢ}^{\text{L}}$ is a glossed cross-reference to Ch., and has no authority; Burn. holds that the plus of Ch. is 'almost indispensable,' which St. rightly denies.—[למך]: Grr. + 'over them.'—[וגרקה]: OGr. as though 'בג', and then with correcting gloss $\kappa. \epsilon\nu \kappa\rho\iota\mu\alpha\sigma\iota\nu \alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\nu$ (Ⓢ^{L} *αυτου*).—For defence of this somewhat plethoric v. see St., as *vs.* Klost., Kit.; *cf.* further elaboration in Ch.—11. Β α, ην [*αιρουσα*], for η.—[מאשר]: to be omitted with Ch., OGr.—[אלמים]: Ch., אֲלִמְיִם (also arbitrarily introduced among the woods of Lebanon, 2 Ch. 2⁷); Ⓢ (= Ⓢ) $\pi\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\kappa\eta\tau\alpha$; $\text{Ⓢ}^{\text{L}} \text{Ⓢ}^{\text{H}}$ (= Ⓢ^{H}) $\alpha\pi\epsilon\lambda$. (*cf.* similar variation in v.²²); Aq., *σουχίνα* = Lat. 'sucinum' (amber); Sym., *θυίνα* (*cf.* $\xi\upsilon\lambda\omicron\nu\theta\upsilon\iota\nu\omicron\nu$, Rev. 18¹²) = Ⓟ ; Grr. in Ch., *πενικίνα*, where Ⓟ 'pinea,' and so Jos.—12. מסע: Ch., מסלול; Grr. *υποστηριγματα*; Ⓟ 'fulcra'; Ⓢ 'for decoration,' *cf.* Ⓜ ; see St., Haupt.—[אלמים] 2⁰: Grr. + $\epsilon\pi\iota \tau. \gamma\eta\varsigma$, evidently gloss from Ch., בארץ יהודה.—13. שלמה [ביר המלך]: absent in 7 Gr. MSS (*cf.* $\text{Ⓢ} \text{Ⓢ}^{\text{L}}$), $\text{Ⓢ} \text{Ⓜ} \text{Ⓟ}$.

15. אנשי: Grr., $\tau. \phi\omicron\rho\omicron\varsigma$, *phoros* translating עֲנֵשׁ, II. 23³³; *cf.* $\text{Ⓢ} \text{Ⓜ}$ אנ, 'rental,' etc., the root being used of tax-collection in the Palmyrene Tariff (Cooke, *NSI*, p. 333); and so correct to עֲנֵשׁ, with Böttcher, *al.* Kamp.'s correction of the text, accepted by Burn., has no basis.—[חיים]: ppl. of חור = Arab. *tāra*, with the noun *tawr*, 'go-between, agent,' and so equal to [המלך] סחרי, 'the royal traders,' v.²⁸; the root occurs in the tribe-name יתור, the Ituræans, a migrant folk. This root is to be distinguished from תור, 'to spy out,' Num. 13², etc., which, like Arab. *ta'ara*, Chr.-Pal. תאר, and the Heb. noun תָּאָר, 'form,' is metaplastic reflexive from *r'y*, 'to see.' The root תאר, 'to circumscribe,' *e.g.*, Jos. 15⁹, is metaplastic from the first root specified. See H. Bauer, *ZfS* 1935, 174 ff., for similar processes. Grr., $\tau. \upsilon\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\epsilon\tau\alpha\gamma\mu\epsilon\nu\omega\nu$, 'the subjects,' a guess; $\text{Ⓢ} \text{Ⓢ}^{\text{L}} \text{Ⓜ}$ 'artisans,' rdg. נְגָרִים. Correction is unnecessary, as with St., to Aram. מְנָרִים, 'merchants,' or with Kit. ערים, 'cities,' with further textual change (*cf.* *BH*).—[וקסר]: read with Klost. יוקסר 'from the profit'; Ch., הסחרים, and similarly OGr. here.—[רבלים]: a word of inter-dialectical usage = Heb. root רבל; $\text{Ⓢ} \text{Ⓢ}^{\text{L}}$ om.; Ⓢ^{H} $\rho\omega\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\omega\lambda\omega\nu$, 'hucksters.'—[הערב]: read with Ch. ערב, and so, 'Arabia' = Aq., Sym., $\text{Ⓢ}^{\text{H}} \text{Ⓢ} \text{Ⓜ} \text{Ⓟ}$; $\text{Ⓢ} \text{Ⓢ}^{\text{L}}$ *του περαν*, as הערב, *i.e.* 'Across-the-River'; Ⓢ 'the allies'; *n.b.* GV 'die Grenzfürsten.'—[פחות הארץ]: 'the land-governors'; for compound idea,

see GK §124, p. Ch. has an exaggerated plus. For the foreign word פתה there are to be added to the citations in GB its appearance in a Lihyanite text of the 5th century B.C.; see F. W. Winnett, 'A Study of the Lihyanite and Thamudic Inscriptions,' *University of Toronto Studies*, 1937, 50 f.—16. צנה: Grr., *ḥopara*; had the translator in mind conventional groups of gifts? Cræsus gave a gold shield and a gold spear to the oracle at Delphi (Her. i, 52). שחוט: the same word, *Ḳr.*, in 'שן הַי, Jer. 9⁷, 'whetted arrow.' The root mng. is dubious, Arab. and Akk. congeners being very polysemantic. Talmudic Heb. has a root 'ש, 'to draw out,' and so Yoma Jer., iv, 41 d, explains the phrase, 'which was drawn out like wax,' and similarly Kimchi (but identifying the root with שנה); this agrees with Gr. *ἐλατά*, used of drawn gold.—18. כופו: Ch., כפור; ט 'good,' ש 'from Ophir,' א 'from India,' פ 'yellow.' But read יפו (cf. כתם אפיו, Dan. 10⁶, and see Montg. *ad loc.*), as proposed by Haupt in *SBOT* and earlier. However יפו, aligned with ורבו and כתם, remains unidentified. There are three current names for gold: והב, Arabian river-gold (see *Arabia and the Bible*, 38 ff.), הרין (Anatolian word?), כתם, these representing different origins or qualities. Another variety of ורבו appears in v.²¹, 6²¹, etc., with the adjective סגור.—19. כנה *bis* = Job 26⁹; many MSS כסא; was the first case intended for *kissehu*?—ראש ענול: so ש א פ; ט כנול, of a revolving mechanism; but Grr., *προτομαι μωσχων*, (=ש^H)=ענול, now generally accepted since Then.; however the sing., ראש ענול, is preferable for the ornament, and so Jos., *Ant.*, viii, 5, 20. Ch. has כפף בונה so generally pointed in edd. = 'footstool,' but read כפף, 'lamb' (see Curtis, *ad loc.*).—כאחירי: Ch. כפף, generally taken as error for the former; but it may correctly represent Akk. *uḥḫuzu*, 'overlaid.'—20. אריית: *vs.* אריית, v.¹⁹, the usual pl., which Ch. has and critics prefer here; but the variant may be a double rdg., with intent of giving a different form for the artificial 'lion'; see numerous cases cited in GK §87, o.—ש: OGrr. om.; it is not necessary.—כמלכה: Ch., כמלכה, and so as sing. Grr., ש^H ש; read כמלכה.—21. The faulty rdg. of Gr. MSS (exc. x), *τα σκευη τα υπο του Σ.*, is to be corrected to *τα σκευη του ποτου Σ.*—והב: Grr., exc. p, κ. *λουτρες χρυσοι* = ו' וריות.—אין כסף: Ch. om. לא, which rdg. St. adopts here; but Grr. = ~~אין~~, which is entirely acceptable: "there was no silver; it was not taken into account."

22. אני: *tris*: Grr. have successively sing., pl., sing.; Ch. has pl. in all cases. St. revises 1⁹ and 2⁰ to the sing. אנית. But the present form is to be retained as collective (so 9²⁶); it disagrees in gender as fem. with אני, v.¹¹, but the noun is fem. at Is. 33¹¹; grammatical regularity is not essential.—אני הרים: ש 'servants of H.' = Ch.—נשף: for the vocalization see GK §74, i.—תניי: 'Ethiopians' of Jos. is prob. to be explained from בניי, listed along with Egyptians, Libyans, Cushites, 2 Ch. 12³, rendered there

by Ⓞ Ⓣ with 'Troglodytes.'—23. B† ignores תרואה.—24. וכל הארץ : Ch., 'כל כלבי הא' and so Grr., Ⓢ Ⓜ ; but this is a grammatical intrusion ; for the syntax see GK §145, e.—אלהים : Grr., 'the Lord' ; cf. 5⁹, etc.—25. [כלי זהב] כלי כסף : OGrr. om. in view of the discount of silver, v.²¹.—קשׁוֹ= 'armour,' II. 10², and so here the VSS (exc. Grr.) and modern VSS ; Grr., σταντην, 'myrrh' ; the Gr. interpretation is correct. based on Arab. *nšḥ*, 'to smell' = Heb. *nšḥ*, 'to kiss' ; see the writer's Note, *JAOS* 1938, 137. For the presence of such spices in the royal treasuries cf. II. 20¹³.—26. ונתם : read with Ch., ונתם, and so VSS.—28. ונתם bis : Ch. ונתם ; Grr., εκ Θεκουε, Eus., *Onom.*, εκ Κωα=Ⓟ 'de Coa' ; read ונתם. *N.b.* the lengthy discussions in Poole, some of the scholars comparing the 'fila Coa' of Egyptian Cos, famous in the ancient world (e.g., Horace, *C.* 4, 13, 13, 'Coæ purpuræ'). One Jewish scholar related the word to alleged ונתם, 'thread.'—יקחו : generally corrected (e.g., St., *BH*) to ויקחו ; but it can stand, with כוצא as actual or implied obj.—29. ונתם : again the full form of the verb ; see GK §75, t.—ונתם[?] : Grr., exc. A x, η εξοδος.—ונתם : MS z, κατα Κυπριαν, with Cyprian Kition in mind.—בירם : Grr., κατα θαλασσαν, as though בירם.—ונתם : =Ch., Ⓢ^H ; Grr., Ⓣ as ונתם, preferred by St., Šanda ; but the Hif. is used absolutely.

Ch. 11. Solomon's apostasy ; a direful oracle for the future ; revolt and insurrection in his domains ; the pericope on the end of the reign and the succession. Ch. ignores except the conclusion. Cf. *Ant.*, viii, 7, 5-8.

VV.¹⁻⁸. Solomon's many foreign wives, who led him astray. The following presentation, along with a revised text, distinguishes an older, simpler account in the left-hand column, and a later, Deuteronomistic and extravagant explanation of the king's fall from virtue.

1. *And king Solomon loved many foreign women* [+gloss and Pharaoh's daughter], *women of Moab, Ammon* [OGrr. +and Aram], *Edom, 'Sidon'* [Grr., exc. Aq., Sym., om.], *Hittites* [OGrr. +and Amorites], 2. *from the peoples as to which YHWH commanded the Bnê-Israel, Ye shall not intermarry with them, nor they with you, lest they pervert your heart after their gods. Solomon clave unto these in love.* 3. *And he had seven hundred wives, princesses, and three hundred concubines ; 'and his wives perverted his heart'* [A al. Ⓢ^H under asterisk].

6. *And Solomon did what was evil in YHWH's eyes, and he was not loyal to YHWH like his father David.*
7. *Then built Solomon a high-place for Chemosh, the god [Ⓘ abomination; Grr. idol] of Moab 'on the hill that is opposite to Jerusalem' [OGrr. om.], and for Milkom [=II. 23¹³, and so here Ⓔ^L; Ⓔ their king: Ⓘ Molek], the god [Ⓘ abomination; Grr. idol] of the Ammonites [Grr. +and to As-tarte, the abomination of Sidonia—from v.⁵].¹*
4. *And it was, when Solomon grew old, that his [Grr. + foreign] wives perverted his heart after other gods, and his heart was not at one with YHWH his God, as was his father David's heart.*
5. *And Solomon followed after Ashtart [Grr. Astarte; Ⓘ Ashtoreth], the god(dess) of Sidonia, and after Milcom, the god [Ⓘ abomination] of the Ammonites [OGrr. om. the v.].* 8. *And so he did for all his foreign wives they censuring and sacrificing to their gods.*

For the unravelling of this skein see the various attempts at analysis by Kamphausen, Benzinger, Kittel, Burney, Stade, Hölscher, the last critic finding two independent themes, the many wives, and Solomon's polytheism. Criticism naturally proceeds from Ⓔ, which varies notably from Ⓘ in order of elements and also in omissions and additions. The most signal difference is in the rearrangement of the introduction, thus: "And king S. was a woman-lover (*φιλογύννης*), and he had 700 princesses and 300 concubines. And he took foreign women, and Pharaoh's daughter, Moabitesses, etc." This order has been preferred by the above-named scholars, except Stade and Hölscher, whose soberer judgment is to be accepted, that Ⓔ represents editorial smoothing of the harshnesses and repetitions of the original. The independent analysis offered above finds a primary simple statement of Solomon's defection, as based on historical testimony to his construction of shrines for foreign gods. The datum in the primary document for the

¹ For the variants for the heathen 'gods' see Pfeiffer, 'The Polemic against Idolatry in the O.T.,' *JBL* 1924, 229 ff. The original 'god' appears in all three cases in the repeated passage, v.³³.

king's apostasy is expressed in annalistic style, *Then built Solomon a high-place for Chemosh the god of Moab*, which has its interesting parallel in Mesha's Moabite stele, "And I made this high-place for Chemosh." Critics vary as to balance of the v., on assumed contamination from II. 23¹³; e.g., Stade and Hölscher omit 'and for Molek,' which the Grr. have, but retain 'on the hill opposite to Jerusalem,' which Grr. om., while Kittel proceeds *vice versa*. Acknowledgment of the provincial deities of Moab and Ammon was quite within the range of Solomon's statecraft. But the secondary document in v.⁵ (omitted by the Grr.) with its initial reference to 'Ashtart of Sidonia' is evidently based on II. 23¹³; the Grr. further introduced it in v.⁷. For the location of the Chemosh sanctuary *on the hill opposite to Jerusalem*, cf. 2 Sam. 15³², how "David came to the top of the ascent, where one was wont to worship God"; this datum may have caused the pious Greek excision of the datum here.²

² Of the alien deities named, Ashtart and Mlkm now appear in the Ras Shamra texts. For a full study of the archæological and literary references to that goddess, as also to Asherah and Anat, see J. B. Pritchard, *Palestine Figurines in Relation to Certain Goddesses Known through Literature*, vol. 24 of *Oriental Series* of the Am. Or. Soc., 1943. For the second of the above deities the Masoretic vocalization of the name, 'Milcom,' in v.⁵ is supported by 𐤌 in v.⁷, where 𐤌 has 'Molek'; the Grr. otherwise read *mal-kām*, 'their king.' For this deity may be cited, *inter al.*, G. F. Moore, 'Molech,' *EB*; M. Buber, *Königtum Gottes*, ch. 5, and notes, pp. 211 ff.; Dhorme, *L'Évolution religieuse d'Israël*, 331 ff. (and for Asherah, pp. 325 ff.). G. Dossin has published a text from Mari, *Rev. d'Ass.*, 35 (1938), 178, presenting a deity, *Ilum-Muluk*; A. Bea, *Biblica*, 20 (1939), 415, identifies the god-name as vocalized with Gr. *Molech*, and claims its identification with the variant *Ilu-Malik*; cf. also N. Schneider, *Biblica*, 18, 337 f.; 19, 204. For the determinative ending, *-ām -ôm = -ân -ôn*, see D. Nielsen, *Ras Shamra Mythologie*, 17 ff., 43, and the writer's Note, *JAOS* 1938, 130 f.; i.e., the name means 'the King.' Cf. the place-name Shomeron, 16²³ (*v. ad loc.*). The vocalization in *molek* follows that of the word, *bošēṭ*, 'shame,' replacing a heathen god's name, e.g., Hos. 9¹⁰, and the *n. pr.*, 'Mephibosheth.' Eissfeldt has proposed a novel and notable re-interpretation of the name as merely a noun representing a cult-practice, the theory based on Punic inscriptions; see his *Molk als Opferbegriff im Punischen u. Hebräischen u. das Ende des Gottes Moloch (Beiträge zur Religionsgeschichte des Altertums, Heft 3, 1935)*, and 'Molochs Glück u. Ende,' *FuF* 1935. 285 ff. The present writer agrees with the adverse criticism of this hypothesis; see Buber, 211 ff., and

The statements as to Solomon's thousand-fold amours cannot be accredited to a formal chronicle, as with some critics, *e.g.*, Hölscher, who finds the only original data therein and in the note of the shrine for Chemosh; chroniclers do not mention such private items, which in the Orient are the gentleman's own business. Apart from the marriage with Pharaoh's daughter (which has been glossed into this text unsyntactically) we know that one of Solomon's wives was an Ammonitess, *i.e.*, mother of Rehoboam (14²¹). Menander of Tyre reports that Solomon married a daughter of Hiram of Tyre (Clem. Alex., *Stromata*, i, 114, 2). David married at least one foreign princess (1 Ch. 3², *cf.* 2 Sam. 13³⁷). The rather absurd figure for the harem is due to popular *Schwelgerei* of the Solomonic legend; this has been adopted by a moralizing editor to explain the king's defection—an early case of *cherchez la femme*. Seven wives and fifteen sons are attributed to David (1 Ch. 3¹¹), and he abandoned ten concubines in Jerusalem (2 Sam. 15¹⁶, 20³). According to *Song of Songs* 6⁸ Solomon's harem consisted of '60 queens and 80 concubines and maidens without number.' *Cf.* Rehoboam's 18 wives and 60 concubines (2 Ch. 11²¹), and the 14 wives of Abijah (*ib.* 13²¹). We may compare the figure given in Solomon's 1005 songs (5¹²; *v. ad loc.*). Bertholet (*History of Heb. Civilization*, 149) presents some comparative cases of such fabulous figures, to which may be added others. Ramses II had 'an enormous harem,' with 100 sons and as many daughters, so Breasted, *HE* 461; according to Meyer, *GA* 2, 1, 576, 138 children. Chosroes II had, it was said, concubines ranging in estimates from 3000 to 12,000 (Rawlinson, *Seventh Oriental Monarchy*, 2, 302). Ali, Mohammed's son-in-law and fourth caliph, had 13 wives, 395 concubines, and his son Hasan 60 and 395 respectively

Dhorme, 213 ff. The most recent exposition of the subject is by Albright, *ARI* 162 ff. (in a study, ch. 5, §3, bearing upon the heathen gods of Palestine), including the somewhat indefinite statement: "Philologically Eissfeldt's argument is convincing, but it now seems certain that the original conception was more complex than he was able to guess at the time," continuing with the archæological data bearing on *mlk*.—'Sidonia' in the above translation represents the unarticulated plural, 'Sidonians'; the pl. has become the land designation, and so for a Greek text, Σιδωνίων ἡ πόλις (Dussaud, *TH* 1, 90). The pl. 'Philistines' is similarly used without the article, *e.g.*, 5¹.

(D. M. Donaldson, *The Shiite Religion*, 1933, pp. 15, 74). The Sultan Mulay Ismail (1672-1727), who recovered Tangier from Catharine of Braganza's dowry, had 500 wives, 1500 children (Margaret Boverie, *Mediterranean Cross-Currents*, 1938, 87). Subsequently a well-informed writer, W. Price, in the *Nat. Geog. Mag.* for May, 1943, p. 84, reports from that locality the tradition for the same sultan of 'his great palace for his 2,000 wives and 800 concubines.' And Prof. P. K. Hitti has given the writer a parallel for this tradition from C. A. Julien, *Histoire de l'Afrique du Nord*, p. 492, assigning the monarch '700 sons and an indefinite number of daughters.' A recent report of an American traveller in Arabia, Whitney Carpenter (*N.Y. Times*, Sept. 11, 1939), states that Ibn Saud, king of Arabia, has had 250 wives and 51 children; but by Islamic law he may have only four at one time.

However justified later condemnation may be, the king with his foreign marriages was obligated to honour the cults his wives brought with them; a later example is the case of Jezebel. On the other hand such intrusions were not popular, for YHWH was the sole national deity, and what we refer to critically as the later Deuteronomic objection to such inter-marriages was only the theological development of deep nationalistic sentiment, early manifested in the prophetic guilds.

VV.⁹⁻¹³. The divine anger and threatening oracle. The mass of this section is compilatory and late. VV.^{11ff.} depend upon vv.^{29ff.} (*vs.* Hölscher); YHWH's twofold appearances are based on 3^{4ff.} and 6¹¹⁻¹³; and the language is Deuteronomistic. 'For David's sake' the dynasty will continue; so far the divine purpose is maintained. However v.^{9a}, *And YHWH was angered at Solomon, because his heart inclined away*, may well be early, and have been originally continued by v.¹⁴, *And YHWH raised up an adversary to Solomon*. More than a century later Mesha king of Moab used the same verb as here (*'np*) of his god's anger: "He [Omri] afflicted Moab many days, for Chemosh was angry against his land." The same theme of theodicy appears early in Babylonia, as in the Sargon Chronicle (L. W. King, *Chronicles Concerning Early Bab. Kings*, 2, 3 ff.; Rogers, *CP* 203 ff.; obv. l. 20) with the judgment on Sargon (with Rogers's translation): "But because of the evil which he had committed the great lord Marduk was angry, and he

destroyed his people by famine. From the rising of the sun unto the setting of the sun they rebelled against him and gave him no rest" (*n.b.* rebellion as in the present story); and of Shulgi (Dungi) it is recorded (rev. l. 5): "(He) richly adorned the city of Eridu . . . but he sought after evil, and the treasure of E-sagila and of Babylon, he brought as spoil. And Bel . . . made an end of him." Similarly an inscription of Nabonidus (published by L. Messerschmidt, *MVG* 1896, pt. 1, col. I, ll. 35 ff.) records that "the king of Assyria, who during the anger of Marduk had worked destruction of the country, was smitten with a weapon by his own son." Like moralizing appears in Hittite texts, as in the inscription of king Telepinus, who details the story of bloodshed in the preceding reigns, and how "at that time the gods exacted of the royal family the penalty for it" (E. H. Sturtevant and G. Bechtel, *A Hittite Chrestomathy*, 1935, 175 ff., 'The Proclamation of Telepinus'). The same theme is manifest in classical historians, notably in the earliest of them, Herodotus. H. T. Fowler has well portrayed the parallelism: "Both Herodotus and the Hebrew historians assume a knowledge of the ways of the unseen powers to which a modern historian would not lay claim. With the Greek, there is that terrible sense of Fate, so familiar in the great tragedies, and the sense, too, that human self-exaltation must receive divine rebuke" ('Herodotus and the Early Hebrew Historians,' 216). And Shotwell in his *Introduction to the History of History*, p. 159, after remarking that "Herodotus remained a devoutly religious man," quotes from Rawlinson, *History of Herodotus*, 1, 94, how in Herodotus's pages "King Cræsus, whom the auriferous Pactolus made the richest of men, Polycrates, tyrant of Samos, or Periander, despot of opulent Corinth—their pride and their end are merely reverberations of the stern melody of human success and divine retribution and the humiliation of men, exemplified most signally in Xerxes himself."

VV.¹⁴⁻⁴⁰. The adversaries whom YHWH raised up against Solomon.

VV.¹⁴⁻²². 25b. Hadad of Edom.

14. And YHWH raised up an adversary to Solomon, Hadad an Edomite [OGrr. insert vv.²³⁻²⁵] of the seed royal [gloss+that

is in Edom]. **15.** And it was, when David 'smote' [with Grr., \mathfrak{S}^{H} \mathfrak{S} \mathfrak{A} —the Heb. impossible; cf. EVV] Edom, when Joab, commander of the host, had gone up to bury the slain, and had smitten every male in Edom—**16.** for Joab and all Israel remained there six months, 'until he had cut off every male in Edom' [repetitious gloss?]**—17.** that Hadad [\mathfrak{H} Adad] fled, with certain Edomites of his father's servants with him, to come to Egypt, Hadad being a young boy. **18.** And they arose from Midian, and came to Paran; and they took some men with them 'from Paran' [OGrr. om.], and came 'to Egypt' [OGrr. om.], to Pharaoh king of Egypt [Grr. +and Ader came in to Pharaoh]. And he gave him a house, ordering sustenance for him, 'and giving him land' [\mathfrak{G} om.] **19.** And Hadad found great favour with Pharaoh, and he gave him for wife the sister of his own wife, the sister of Tahpenes the queen. **20.** And the sister of Tahpenes bore him Genubath his son, and Tahpenes weaned [Grr. reared] him 'within Pharaoh's household' [3 Ken. MSS and Grr., among Pharaoh's sons]; and Genubath was 'in Pharaoh's household' [Grr., exc. x, om.; \mathfrak{S}^{H} under asterisk] among Pharaoh's sons. **21.** And when Hadad heard in Egypt that David slept with his fathers, and that Joab, commander of the host, was dead, Hadad said to Pharaoh: Let me depart, that I may go to my country. **22.** And Pharaoh said to him: But what lackest thou with me, that thou seekest to go to thy country? But he said: Nay, but let me go off. [Grr. +And Hadad returned to his country.] (VV.^{23-25a}: v. inf.) **25b.** And the evil which Hadad—[so \mathfrak{H} ; OGrr., this is the evil which Hadad did; cf. EVV]. And he despised Israel, and reigned over 'Edom' [with 3 Heb. MSS, Grr., \mathfrak{S}^{H} , \mathfrak{S} \mathfrak{A} ; \mathfrak{H} Aram].

In \mathfrak{H} the reading 'Aram' for 'Edom,' by confusion of two similar letters, has caused here the interpolation of the narrative of the Aramæan Hadadezer, vv.^{23-25a}. On the other hand \mathfrak{G} transferred vv.^{23-25a} in abbreviated form to the end of v.¹⁴; was this passage omitted in the earliest form of \mathfrak{G} , and then subsequently introduced gloss-wise in parallelism with the other theme of an 'adversary'?³ In the Hadad narrative

³ The order of \mathfrak{G} would be sustained by Winckler's arbitrary thesis that Hadad was an Aramæan, so that the narrative opened with reference to two Aramæan adversaries; see *GI* 2, 270 ff., *KAT* 240 ff. An earlier thesis of Winckler's found in the present story a composition

there are certain broken connexions, some possible duplicates, which give the appearance of compilation from two sources; 6 recognized the condition, and tried to improve it; and criticism on this basis was followed not only by Winckler in his theses referred to, but also by Klostermann, Meyer at length (*IN* 355 ff.), and Hölscher, p. 177, who finds his two sources, J and E. But the present commentator agrees with Kittel and Stade in rejecting such source-analyses here. With the realization that we possess in the present case one of the most unique historical stories in the Hebrew Bible, the biography of a fugitive Edomite prince, who fled to Egypt and subsequently regained his throne, we may hardly think of its appearance in two separate editions, J and E, or what not. The details, unimportant enough in sacred history (Winckler would find traces of myth!), were evidently taken from a reliable first-hand document, and the roughnesses of the present text may best be ascribed to some evident glosses, along with mutilation in the tradition. Šanda well remarks: "Mit welcher Treue R(edakteur) diese (alten Quellen) widergibt, zeigt die Lückenhaftigkeit des durch das Alter beschädigten Dokuments." Of parallel interest is the list of the royal Edomite line in Gen. 36^{31ff.}. How such sources came into the hands of Israelite archivists is a problem for historiography. One clue to the editor may be found in the use of 'God' at v.²³, with the supposition that this name was changed to 'YHWH' at the introduction of the narrative, v.¹⁴; he would then have been an 'Elohist.'

14. For the good Edomite and S. Arabic name *Hadad* see below. 15. 16. The grammar, even with correction of 19, is clumsy, asyndetic, literally, "in David's smiting . . . in Joab's going up." The first item appears in 2 Sam. 8¹³, the second in the title of Ps. 60, "and Joab returned and smote of Edom in the Valley of Salt twelve thousand" (dependent on our passage), while yet another hero is named in 1 Ch. 18¹²: "Abishai b. Seruiah smote of the Edomites in the Valley of Salt eighteen thousand." The references to Joab

of two narratives, of the Edomite Hadad, and a Midianite Adad (on basis of the spelling in v.¹⁷; see his *Alltest. Untersuchungen*, 1 ff.); his analysis is presented by Burney, with apparently the latter's favourable opinion; a similar analysis is followed by Benzinger.

are doubted by Wellhausen, Driver, Meyer (*IN* 359 f.); and yet his name could not have been introduced gratuitously in a Davidic anecdote. The material is evidently a prime historical note, early contributed by an Israelite annotator. The repeated statement of the annihilation of all Edomite males is indeed an exaggeration. The 'burying of the dead' affords trouble; Kittel suggests that there was a massacre of Israelites, which Joab was sent to avenge; Šanda would find something quite different by changing the text. But the phrase may mean the celebration of triumph; the first act of the victor being the honour due to the dead; the planned extermination of the Edomites followed. **17. 18.** The fugitive's itinerary is given in broken style; it is beyond our control, and the amendment of 'Midian' to 'Maon,' proposed by Thenius, accepted by Stade, is gratuitous; the reverse correction with the Gr. at Jud. 10¹² proves nothing here. Maon, modern Ma'ān, lies E of Petra, but the flight was made first into the desert land of Midian, E of the Red Sea, whence Hadad subsequently fled westwards across the Sinai desert to Egypt (so Šanda). Paran is indefinite enough; according to Num. 13²⁶ Kadesh of the Wanderings lay in Paran; the Mount of Paran occurs in the sacred legend, Dt. 33², in parallelism with Sinai and Seir, and in Hab. 3³ along with Teman. An oasis Feiran, of ancient Christian tradition, lies N of Jebel Serbal in Sinai (see E. H. Palmer, *Desert of the Exodus*, 1872, Index, s.v., Kittel, *GVI* 1, 345, n. 3); Arabic geographers know of a Faran, 40 Arabic miles S of Suez (Le Strange, *Palestine under the Moslems*, 440). A possibility is identification with El-paran on Chedorlaomer's route (Gen. 14⁶); see GB 30b; this identification is accepted by Meyer (*IN* 60, n. 5), but denied by Skinner in his *Genesis*, ad loc. If our Paran be so identified, then Hadad would have pivoted about it in proceeding from Midian to Egypt. For his itinerary cf. Glueck's statement (*BASOR* 71 [1938], 7) that "a direct road led in ancient times, as to-day, from the head of the Gulf of 'Aqabah through Sinai to Egypt." Hadad's reception and treatment as a prince by Pharaoh was proper Oriental etiquette, and in this case, as with Jeroboam (v.⁴⁰), good politics. For the royal matrimonial alliance cf. 3¹. The item of this marriage has been taken over bodily into the secondary Jeroboam

midrash of the Gr., 12^{24e. f.} 19. 20. The repeated *sister* is necessary to precise the proper name as that of the queen (so Stade, *vs.* Kittel). Klostermann, Kittel (not 3H), Benzinger follow the Greek midrash at 12²⁴, where the second 'sister' is represented with a proper name, *Ανω* (which may possibly represent an Egyptian name as 'hnt or 'knh or 'nwt), but there is no ground to accept the text of that perverted story. The word for 'queen' here is the unusual 'Mistress,' otherwise used for the queen-mother, *e.g.*, 15¹³. 20. The *v.* implies that the child of the marriage was adopted into the royal family. There has been retained above the text of ~~Ἡ~~, that the queen *weaned him*, *vs.* the misreading or simplification of the Gr., accepted by Klost. and most subsequent critics, that she *reared him*; not to the point is Stade's comment that "T. is neither mother nor the wet-nurse of the child"; there may well be allusion to an adoptive rite, like the 'bearing on the knees' by the adoptive mother, *e.g.*, Gen. 30³ (see Skinner, *ad loc.*). For the item *cf.* Esarhaddon's reference to the Arab Queen Tabua, "born in my palace" (Esarh., Prism A, col. 3; CP 355; ARA 2, §536). 22. The implication at end of the verse was sufficient in ancient story, and the Gr. plus, that "he returned to his land," is not demanded, as with critics (*e.g.*, Klost., Stade). 25. In the first sentence it is all too easy to accept the Gr. rendering, with Böttcher, Thenius, and most successors; but that was only a guess at a mutilated passage, for what was "the evil that Hadad did" after all? There is an evident lacuna before the passage. The word translated *despised* expresses political contempt; Burney well defines it as of racial hostility, *cf.* Ex. 1¹², Num. 22³; there is no reason, as with some critics, to change the text and to read 'oppressed.'

The above narrative, of decidedly original order—to be compared with some Herodotean anecdotes—touches both Edomite and Egyptian history. Gen. 36³¹⁻³⁹ gives a series of eight kings who reigned in Edom "before there reigned a king in Israel." Two of the series are named Hadad, including the last king, with whom our prince may have been closely connected. For the variant spelling 'Adad,' v.¹⁷, see Notes; *cf.* Bibl. names Hadoram and Adoram. For the Edomite history

see Buhl, *Geschichte der Edomiter*, and Meyer, *IN* 370-86. Which member of Dynasty XXII is the Pharaoh indicated is no clearer than in the case of Solomon's father-in-law (3¹, *q.v.*). The name of the queen (with variants in Heb. MSS and the Grr.) has not been identified; it occurs as name of a city, Jer. 2¹⁶, etc. Such a matrimonial alliance, despite Solomon's relation with the dynasty, was quite in keeping with international double-dealing. Hadad returned upon hearing of David's death. Cf. Glueck's sagacious statement (*BASOR* 71 [1938], 9, n. 21) that Solomon inherited Esion-geber from David, comparing Joab's attempted extermination of the Edomites, and that David's hold over Edom "must have been more absolute than Solomon's."

23-25a. Rezon of Damascus. **23.** *And God raised up an adversary to him, Rezon ben Eliada, who fled from his lord Hadadezer king of Damascus; 24. and 'there were gathered' [with Grr.; H he gathered] certain men to him, and he became captain of a bandit-band [when David smote them—G G^L om.; gloss from 2 Sam. 8⁵]; and he took [with OGrr.; H went to] Damascus, and settled there, and became king in Damascus [the three verbs in sing. with OGrr. (cf. note); H has pl.]. 25a. And he was adversary to Israel all the days of Solomon.*

This is another authentic record, with details of Syrian history, concluding with the statement of Rezon's hostility to Solomon during the latter's whole reign, in striking contrast to the fulsome description of Solomon's empire and his security from all wars (5^{4f.}); cf. the remark at end of the previous paragraph. The anecdote connects with the original records of David's successful wars against Aram, represented by Hadadezer, king of Sobah (2 Sam. 8, 10); cf. the Gr. plus in 14²⁶ of the booty which "David took from the sons of Hadadezer, king of Sobah." The crushing of that kingdom threw Syria into confusion, out of which arose one of the king's captains, Rezon, first appearing as a captain of condottieri, like David at Adullam (1 Sam. 22), and finally seizing the important city-state of Damascus. He is the first king of Damascus known to us by name. Throughout history Syria has been the theatre of such seizures of power by bold men; witness the Arab dynasties of later days in Chalkis, Ituræa, Emesa; and indeed

Rezon, with a name to be explained from the Arabic, may have been of the same stock.⁴

VV.²⁶⁻⁴⁰. The rise of Jeroboam. For the late midrash-like legend of Jeroboam in the Gr. after 12²⁴ see discussion *in loco*. The present story is editorially attached to those of the two 'adversaries,' but is of different origin. Of the whole narrative only vv.²⁶⁻²⁸.⁴⁰ contain original material, vv.²⁹⁻³⁹ belonging to a later Prophet-Saga. Of the remainder v.^{27b} is an intruded archival datum (*cf.* Meyer, *IN* 367, n. 5), in no way aligned with the story of Jeroboam, who was actually *over the levy of the house of Joseph* (v.²⁸). There is also evident lacuna between v.^{27a}, *And this is the account how he* (Jeroboam) *raised his hand* (*i.e.*, rebelled) *against the king*, and v.^{40a}, *And Solomon sought to kill Jeroboam*. We have to suppose loss of some definite overt act on Jeroboam's part, which caused his flight, and which would equally account for the partisans who ultimately made him king of the North. That datum has been replaced with the popular story of the prophet Ahijah (vv.²⁹⁻³⁹), who appears again in a similar story in ch. 14. But the story may well have foundation in fact in view of the early prophetic objection to royalty. For the motivation of Solomon's hostility supplied by the Gr., v.^{24b}, see below.

26. Jeroboam's home, Şerēdāh, has been located at the spring 'Ain Şerīdah in the Wady Deir Ballūt in western Samaria, is not to be confused with the corrupt 'Şeredah' of 2 Ch. 4¹⁷; see Albright, *BASOR* 11 (1923), 5 ff.; 49 (1933), 26 ff.; *JPOS* 1925, 37; *cf.* Abel, *GP* 2, 457. The place-name survived as appellative of one of the early Tanna'im (*P. Aboth*, i, 4). There is good historic reminiscence in the item that Jeroboam's mother was a widow, whose name, Şerū'āh, means leprous (in the broad sense of skin diseases); accordingly many critics, *e.g.*, Kittel, Stade, Šanda, regard this name,

⁴ Şobah has not been certainly identified; see Dussaud, *TH* 233 f.; 2 Ch. 8³ connects it with 'Hamath-Sobah.' For the Ass. references to Şubat/Şubit see Schiffer, *Die Aramäer*, 135 ff.; Kraeling, *Aram and Israel*, 41 f., making identification with Chalcis-al-Anjar in Cœle-Syria; Forrer, *Die Provinzeinteilung d. ass. Reiches*, pt. 1, 62, identifying with Baalbek. For the reports of David's wars see Meyer, *GA* 2, 2, 251 ff. E. Cavaignac identifies Hadadezer with the *šar māt Arumu*, referred to in an inscription of Assurabi II of Assyria, *ca.* 1000 B.C. (*RHR* 107 [1923], 134 ff.).

omitted here by the Grr., as an opprobrious addition, comparing Gr. 12^{24b}, where she is called 'a harlot,' with the logical omission of the father's name, Nebat. But names indicating personal deformities were in vogue with the intent of averting the corresponding demons; see Noth, *IP* 227, and e.g., Simon the Leper, properly Simon Garbā, Mt. 26⁶.

27b. *Solomon built the Millo.* He closed up the breach of the City of David (with unnecessary plus, his father). Of these two archival items, probably in their original order, the first is cited in 9¹⁵. This breach and its reconstruction have been revealed by Macalister and Duncan in their *Excavation of the Hill of Ophel* (*PEF Annual*, 4 [1926]), esp. 74 ff., and Crowfoot and Fitzgerald, *Excavations in the Tyropæon Valley* (vol. 5); also current reports in *QS* 1924-25, and Duncan, *ZAW* 1924, 221 ff.; photographs of the excavations are given by Olmstead, *HPS*, plates 134-7. On the present passage see also Weill, *La cité de David*, 24 ff. **28.** The epithet applied to Jeroboam, translated in EVV with 'a mighty man of valour' ('valour' = Heb. *ḥayl* = Lat. *virtus*) means in the present connexion 'capable' and the following 'doer of work' corresponds to English 'efficient.' There may be noticed Meyer's view (*IN* 367) that the former term means 'ein waffenpflichtiger Grundbesitzer,' and that the young Jeroboam had already come into his inheritance; for this interpretation cf. II. 15²⁰. His function as *over the labour* [literally *portage*—see at 5²⁹; another word than 'levy,' e.g., 4⁶, but they were practically identical, cf. Gen. 49¹⁴] of the house of Joseph is absolute contradiction of 9^{21f}. We may suppose that this office gave him an insight into the dissatisfaction of the people, which aroused his ambitions and made him a rebel. **34.** *I will make him prince.* The noun 'prince' translates *nāšî'*, and so is distinct from the other term similarly translated, *nāgîd*, used in the oracles concerning Saul (1 Sam. 9¹⁶, 10¹) and David (2 Sam. 5², 1 Ki. 1³⁵, etc.). Within Israelite politics our word does not appear again until Ezekiel, whose favourite term it was for the lay head of the church-state. As Noth has shown at length in his *System der Zwölfstämme Israels*, 93, and Exc. III, the word early implied a religious function, used of tribal representatives at solemnities, and so 'the princes of the tribes,' Num. 7⁹.

etc. The same word is used of sacred functionaries in the Phœnician crown-inscription from the Piræus (Lidzbarski, *HNE* 425; Cooke, *NSI* no. 33). But the term is of ancient political standing, used of the Ishmaelite princes (Gen. 17²⁰), of the Midianites (Josh. 13²¹), and, as not observed by Noth, it appears in S. Arab. (Conti Rossini, *Chrestomathie*, 190). The use of the word here is a true tradition of the early religious and also democratic objection to monarchy. Cf. Ibn Khaldun's illuminating discussion of the transformation of the caliphate into monarchy, *mulk*, in Islam (*Prolegomena*, bk. 3, ch. 28).

40. Jeroboam fled to Egypt like the Edomite Hadad. The name of a Pharaoh is here given for the first time in the Bible; for Shishak see Comm., 14²⁵. This drama took place in the latter part of Solomon's reign.

VV.⁴¹⁻⁴³. The death of Solomon and the succession. V.⁴¹, with its reference to *the Book of the Acts of Solomon*, presents the first chapter, as it were, of the series subsequently known as 'the Chronicles of the Acts of the Kings of Judah/Israel,' e.g., 14¹⁹⁻²⁹; see Int., §13, b. **42.** The alleged reign of *forty years* is the same as that ascribed to David; this round figure of the average generation again indicates absence of such data in the early archives. The forty-one years ascribed to Rehoboam (14²¹) may be similarly artificial, the datum putting his birth in Solomon's first royal year; or the reverse may be the case, this datum being original, and Solomon's reign being dated from it. **43.** *And his son Rehoboam reigned in his stead.* The story of the inception of the civil war, interrupting the coronation ceremony at Shechem, and its consequences (12-14²⁰), disturbed the sequence elsewhere followed of personal details concerning the new king, as e.g., 15⁹⁻¹¹. For Rehoboam these are given at 14^{21ff.}. The parallelism of the names of the rivals, R. and Jeroboam, with the common element 'am, is of interest, but accidental. Despite its use as specification of a Pagan deity, the divine 'Kinsman,' or 'Uncle,' it was constant in Hebrew names, e.g., Amram, Ammishaddai, and in the immediate family line Eliam, father of Bathsheba (2 Sam. 11³), given in Ch. as Ammiel (1 Ch. 3⁵). The name of the king, 'Rehab'am' (and so GV 'Rehabeam'), was assimilated by G to 'Jeroboam,' and became 'Roboam' (and so FV), which the English Bible followed with

'Rehoboam.' See Note further, and especially for another and ingenious explanation of the name.

For the Gr. of vv.¹⁻³ see Rahlfs, SS 3, 215 f., cf. 116 f., finding the primitive text only in B \mathfrak{C} \mathfrak{G}^L and Irenæus.—**1.** את בת פרעה: the clause is syntactically impossible. Older commentators discussed whether this princess was to be included in the ban on 'strange women,' some making of her a convert, adducing Ps. 45¹¹; see Poole, Hitz.—אָרְנִיָּה, אָרְנִיָּה: the pointing of 'ע' as at Neh. 13²³; the heavy final syllables induced shortening of the internal long syllables, e.g., אָרְנִיָּה, v.⁵.—Gr. Στρας κ. Ἰδομαίας presents the double rdg. אַרְם/אַרְם.—**2.** אָבֵן: usual tr. 'surely,' but inappropriate here; Kloster, St., al. as error for טָן=Gr. μῆ; but it is to be equated with Syr. 'aikān, 'so that'; see Montg., JBL 1912, 144 ff.—**3.** וַיִּזְכֹּר, וַיִּזְכֹּר: for the grammatical disagreements with the subjects see GK §145.—**5.** עֲשֵׂתָרָה אֱלֹהֵי צ': the deformation of the divine name after the pattern of ba'al > bosheth. Bibl. Heb. lacks a fem. to אֱלֹהֵי; אֱלֹהֵי appears in Phœn., Ugaritic. Burn. cf. Phœn. עֲשֵׂתָרָה, 'to his god Asht., and further Phœn. exx. are given by Nielsen, Ras Šamra Mythologie, 22 f.—**8.** טַקְטִירוֹת: for the independent syntax of the ppl. cf. בְּנֵי־שָׁמַיִם, 5¹, and see GK §116, s.—**9.** תִּקְרָא: the ppl. pointed as pf., the art. then being treated as rel. pron.; cf. the same use of art. at Gen. 12⁷, 35¹; for discussion of these and similar anomalies see Burn., GK §138, 3b.—**10.** וַיִּזְכֹּר: Kloster, Burn., comparing the Gr., correct to the ppl., וַיִּזְכֹּר; St. is properly dubious; but the pf. is in consecutive order after the prec. ppl.—'וְגַם' the clause is parenthetical, is not to be changed to 'וְגַם' with Kloster, Burn., after the Gr.—צוֹה 2⁰; 4 MSS צוֹהוּ, so VSS exc. Grr. g e₂.—**11.** עֵבֶךְ: for the prep. in psychological sense see BDB 768b; e.g., Job 10¹³, בְּלִבְבִּי וְעֵבֶךְ.—בְּרִיחֵי וְחַמֵּי: Gr. missed the usual בְּרִיחֵי, and translated the first word with εντολας; \mathfrak{S} \mathfrak{A} added it at the end.—**12.** אֶקְרָעָה: Grr., λημψομαι αυτην, as though אֶקְרָעָה which change is accepted by Kloster, Burn., on ground of correspondence with vv.³⁴⁻³⁵; rather the Gr. avoided the harsh verb, and so again at v.¹³.—**13.** יְרוּשָׁלַם: Grr., \mathfrak{S} , \mathfrak{A} + 'the city,' after common usage.—**14.** עֵינַי: Grr. here and below Σαταν.—הָרִי: also MSS הָרִי=Gr. Ἀδερ; at Gen. 36³⁶⁻³⁹ \mathfrak{H} has both forms; see also Comm., 15¹⁸. This divine name, common in W. Sem. *nu. pr.* (see Lidzb., HNE 258), also occurs singly for such names in S. Arab. (NPS 1, 71 f.). In v.¹⁷ Akkadizing אֶדֶר appears. The name אֶדֶר, alternate to אֶדֶר, occurs in Ugaritic. For the divine name used for human nomenclature cf. 'Jehu,' II. 9².—וְרַע הַמֶּלֶךְ: the correction to the Hebrew, after Gr. τ. βασιλειας (=II. 25²⁵), with Kloster, St., is not necessary.—הוּא בְּאֵינֵם: recognized by some critics as gloss to preceding הַמֶּלֶךְ; rather it is gloss to the impossible אֶדֶר אֵינֵם, v.¹⁵; sc. understand את אֶדֶר as אֶדֶר.—**15.** בְּהִיּוֹת: very early error for הַבְּהִיּוֹת=2 Sam. 8¹³, and so here Grr. του εὐλοθερευσαι= \mathfrak{S}^H \mathfrak{A} \mathfrak{S} .—**17.** אִישׁוּם: the word=Engl. 'certain'; see Note, 3¹⁶. Grr., exc.

Ⓢ^L, pref. 'all.'—18. טרין : Ⓢ Ⓢ^H τ. πολεις Μαδιαμ; for 'city of Midian' see Musil, *Topographical Itineraries*, No. I, Index.—מפארן, מוצרים : OGr. om.—יבאו : B*† αρχοντες for ερχονται.—אטר : 'ordered,' the mng. as in Arab.—וארין נתן לו : Ⓢ om.; the verbal sequence is abnormal.—19. תהבנים : MSS have variants; Gr., Θεκεμεινας, etc. Cf. the identical place-name, Jer. 2¹⁶, etc., Eze. 30¹⁸; for suggested interpretations see GB, and most recently B. H. Stricker, *Analecta Orientalia*, 15 (1937), 11. תבנייה—Grr. της μειζω, suggesting to Klost. תבנייה (!), 'the elder,' to Kit., St. הנרולה; both suggestions quite unnecessary.—20. נגנת : the mng. of the name cannot be explained from the Heb., with the root mng. 'to steal,' but from the Arabic, with its diverse developments, e.g., *junub* = 'guest.' Safaitic *n. pr. Gnb* occurs (*NPS* 2, 43). The Gr. read as 'Genibat,' which would represent a diminutive formation, *gunaiibat*. The fem. form for masc. names is common in Old Sem., e.g., Canaanite אגנת, Edomitic מנתת, Ammonite שבנת, and appears in Nab., e.g., תרת, Palm. ארנית.—תמלוהו : Gr., εξεθρεψεν αυτον, i.e., as from תמלוהו; see Comm.—21. [שלהני] ואלך : the cohortative is expected; see Orlinsky, *JQR* 32 (1941), 197.—22. לא : 'No!' (EVV 'Nothing'); a similar case at Gen. 19² approves such mng. here, vs. Burn. 22 MSS לו = Gr., αυτω. See Bär's note on the Masoretic punctuation.

VV.^{23-25a}, inserted in v.¹⁴ by OGr., are in place in Hex.—23. ריון = 'prince,' Pr. 14²⁸; the name *Rzn* occurs in Sabæan (*NPS* 1, 199); OGr., Εσρωμ/ν.—אלידע : the name and ידעאל are frequent in S. Arab. (*ib.*, 2, 28, 69).—הרר[עור] = Ⓢ^H ט א ; 47 MSS הרר = Ⓢ^L Ⓢ^H Ⓢ^H Ⓢ^H ; see Note, v.¹⁴.—אשר ברה מאת—OGr. transcribed with τος (= אטר) εν Ραεμαθ (so the simplest form of many variants, see Rahlfs, *SS* 3, 217); Ⓢ^H has a variant transcription, τος Βαραμειθ, in which Ⓢ^H found a patronymic, בר אמאת.—24. ויקבן : Gr., Ⓢ^H (S) as ויקבני, generally adopted since Then.—ארת : Klost., Šanda, *BH* propose ארת with 2 Sam. 8⁸; but the gloss may have been carelessly expressed.—וימלכו, וישבו, וילכו : Ⓢ (but B *al.* om. clauses 2 and 3 through homoiotel. of 'Damascus'); Ⓢ read וילכו (the false rdg. having induced the foll. pls. in Ⓢ) and וישב, and so Ⓢ^H, a correction generally accepted.—25a. "and he was an adversary to Israel"; *n.b.* the contradiction in Ⓢ^L, 2^{46g}, "there was no Satan (the Heb. word!) in Solomon's days."—25b. ואת הרעה אשר הרר : OGr., αυτη η κακια ην εποιησεν Α., as though rdg. the verb עשה, and so ט Ⓢ, followed by EVV (JV not noting the addition to Ⓢ); Ⓢ^H αυτη η κακια Α. (=Ⓢ^H Ⓢ), "this is the evil of A." (treating אטר as ל אשר = NHeb. לש) = Ⓢ; 6 MSS attempted improvement with plus [הרר] את " (which was) with H."—ויקן : VSS, exc. ט Ⓢ as = קק (to avoid the former contemptuous word), accepted by Grätz, *BH*, but see St.'s long note; that "he oppressed Israel" is historically most improbable; also that verb requires the foll. prep. ל. Joüon sugg. ויקם, after v.²³, but an object is then desiderated.

26. ירבעם : for the name see Comm. and Note on v. 43.—נבט : the name only in this connexion ; it is frequent in S. Arab. by itself and in composition (*NPS* 2, 92).—הצודרה=Hex. ; OGr., *Σαπειρα*, as at 12^{24b}.—צרועה : OGr. om. the name of the mother here, have it at 12^{24b}, where the variants suggest a confusion with the place-name הצודרה.—הצודרה במלך : וירם יד במלך : 12^{24b}, “and he was rising up against the kingdom.”—27. הזלויה : see Lexx. for connexion with Akk. *mulū*, ‘an artificial terrace’ ; but there is also the use of the verb. in S. Arab. in parallelism with *bnay*, ‘to build’ (Conti Rossini, *Chrest.*, 177) ; the same name for the fortress at Shechem, Jud. 9⁶. 20.—27b. Grr. here = 7. Gr. 12^{24b} has the plus, “(he built the Akra) with the levies of the house of Ephraim” ; but Gr. 2^{35e} κ. ακοδομησεν τ. ακραν επαλξεν επ αυτης διεκοψεν τ. πολιν Δ., i.e., rdg. סנר אה as סנרה = επαλξίς, ‘fortress,’ and פָּרַץ as פָּרַץ ; see Montg., *ZAW* 1932, 127.—28. כל : Grr., 15 om.—see Note, 5²⁹.—29. אהיה : both this form and אהיהו appear in 14^{4a}, the latter also in 2 Ch. 10¹⁵. The latter spelling appears in a 7th century Jerusalem ostrakon ; see Albr., *JPOS* 1926, 38 ff., Diringer, *IAE* 74.—בדרר : OGr. plus “and stood him off from the road” (not in Lucif.) ; but below for בדרה 15 has ‘on the road.’—והוא : Grr. exegetically, κ. ο Αχαιας.—31. Grr. om. the art. in ‘the ten tribes,’ which appears preferable, but is correction of a careless phrase ; art. in השבטים prob. by dittography.—32. השבט האחד : Grr., 15 ‘two tribes,’ and so at v. 36. As Rahlfs notes (*SS* 3, 99), Jos. knew the Heb. text, but compromised with 15, producing : ‘one tribe and the one adjoining it.’ There is no reason for correction of the previous figure ‘10’ to ‘11’ (cf. *BH*) ; in later parlance there were the ten tribes of the North, and the one, Judah, constituting the South.—33. עובוי (3 MSS עובוי ישחווו (3 other MSS ישחווו) : הלבו : the VSS, including Aq., Sym. properly as singulars.—אהיה *trivis* : original as *vs.* the abusive terms in vv. 5-7, which terms are reproduced in Grr. here.—צרינין : 15 MSS א/.—והקתי ומשפטי : OGr. om. ; an addition suggested by v. 38.—34. כל 10 : Kit. (Comm., *BH*) elides without good reason.—נשיא אשתנו (4 MSS נשיא א) : Grr., *αντιτασσομενος αντιταξομαι αυτω*, ‘I will oppose him’ = 15, with same translation as at Hos. 1⁶, נָשָׂא אֶפְסָא לָהֶם. Lucian in view of inconsequence of the statement at this point transferred it to beginning of the v., obtaining, “I will oppose him . . . and will not take the kingdom from his hand” ; see Rahlfs, *SS* 3, 201 f.—והקתי . . . אישר 20 : 15 om.—35. מלוכה : but מלוכה vv. 31, 34.—את עשרת השבטים : to be omitted with St., *al.* as grammatically superfluous after the verbal suffix, although exegetically proper ; Grr. ignore the suffix.—36. שבט אחד : Grr., 15, ‘the two tribes.’—ניר : 15 *θεσις* = 15 *segyāmā*—by what kind of interpretation ? 15 by corruption *θέλησις*. The word is translated with *κατάλειμμα* at 15⁴, but correctly with *λύχνος*, II. 8¹⁹, with which word the Three render it in all places.—37. כל : Grr. arbitrarily om.—38bβ. 39. 15 om.—39. ואענה : for the pointing cf.

Zec. 11⁵; see Bär and Ginsb.².—40. ירבעם 2⁰: OGr. om.—ויברת: B† a doublet, κ. ἀνεστῆ κ. ἀπεστῆ.—שישק: but Kt. 14²⁵ שושק; v. *ad loc.*—41. חכמרו: Grr. (exc. 71), Ⓜ^H pref. 'all.'—2⁰ דברי שלמה: Ⓜ^L Ⓜ as though 'דברי הימים לש', after the usual form. Ⓜ tr. the first noun with ῥήματα, but Ⓜ^L correctly with λόγοι.—42. על כל ישראל: Ⓜ om.—43. אביו: 2 MSS om. OGr. intrude here 12², with further complication.—הרבעם: the verbal element is common in Heb. names and also in S. Arab. names (see *NPS* 2, 123). It may be explained from derivative mngs. of the Arabic, as though 'to be broadminded, generous,' and hence Stem II, 'to welcome.' A parallel name appears in רהביו, 1 Ch. 23¹⁷, in which connexion GB cites a possible Bab. correspondent, 'Ra'bi-ilu.' But Albr., in *AJSL* 38 (1922), 140 f., *cf.* the name with Bab. 'Hammu-rabi,' as = 'the family is extended,' and presents other like early names in that language. And for 'Rehoboam' as a possible 'throne-name' see the same scholar in *AASOR* 21-22 (1943), 67, adducing Pharaonic examples. But there are no similar correspondents in Heb. names, and the parallelism seems far afield. If it be accepted, then Jeroboam's name may have been a defiant alias on part of the rebel, 'the people is great, is master,' after the Arab. and Aram. mng. of the root *rb̄b*; but there is the good old name, Jerubbaal.

12¹⁻²¹. The division of the kingdom. || 2 Ch. 10; *cf.* *Ant.*, viii, 8, 1-3. The Heb. text, treated by itself apart from the Gr. supplement (see at end of this section) has a grave inconcinnity in that it connects Jeroboam's return from Egypt, his being summoned to the parliament, and his leadership in its demands, with the succession of Rehoboam, while according to v.²⁰ the news of the return of Jeroboam and the summons to him are subsequent to the revolt. This disagreement is solved by excising vv.^{2-3a}, absent in OGr. (*n.b.* the parenthesis in EVV) as an intrusion from Ch. (*n.b.* Ch.'s common word *ḳāhāl* vs. *ēdāh*, v.²⁰, both translated usually with 'congregation'), excising 'Jeroboam' in v.¹² (with the Grr.), and adding, v.²⁰, the phrase 'from Egypt' to 'Jeroboam returned' (with Grr. MSS). VV.^{2-3a} are necessary to Ch.'s narrative, in which Jeroboam's early history was omitted, but are superfluous here. With these excisions, excluding certain contradictions and superfluities, Jeroboam does not appear as ringleader of the revolt, but his election is an afterthought of the rebels. The above criticism is that of Meyer's (*IN* 363 ff.). Hölscher would excise only v.^{3a}; Kittel transfers v.² to beginning of the ch., and so Stade; Klostermann and Kittel expand this v. from

the Gr. suppl., inserted in 11⁴³ and 12^{24d}, viz., "and J. heard in Egypt that S. was dead, and he came to his city Sareira," etc. The text so revised appears as follows: **1.** *And Rehoboam went to Shechem, for all Israel came to Shechem to make him king.* [**2.** *And it was, when Jeroboam ben Nebat heard, while he was still in Egypt, whither he had fled from king Solomon, that Jeroboam 'returned from Egypt'* (with Ch., G^{H} S^{H} ; H *dwelt in Egypt*). **3.** *and they sent and called him. And came Jeroboam and all the congregation of Israel.*] *And they* [Grr. *the people*] *spoke to Rehoboam, etc.* **12.** *And came* [*Jeroboam and*] *all Israel* [so most Grr.; H *all the people*=Ch.] *to Rehoboam, etc.* (vv.¹³⁻¹⁹). **20.** *And it was, when all Israel heard that Jeroboam had returned 'from Egypt'* [with some Grr. C S^{H}], *that they sent and called him to the assembly, and they made him king over all Israel, etc.* 'From Egypt,' v.²⁰, was omitted as repeating and contradicting v.²; then the sentence in the latter v. was changed by slight scribal and oral touch to 'he dwelt in Egypt,' to avoid repetition of the 'returning' below. Also v.¹⁷, a disturbing interlude, is an intrusion from Ch. Kittel prefers the text of Gr. v.^{24q. r} to vv.⁶⁻⁹, but without sufficient reason. Meyer (*IN*, 365) regards as an original element the addition to v.⁴ in Gr. v.^{24p}, κ. ἐβάρυνεν τὰ βρώματα τῆς τραπέζης αὐτοῦ; cf. 5^{7f}.

Shechem was the place chosen by *all Israel* for the formal recognition of Rehoboam as Solomon's successor, *to make him king*. It was central and accessible, and, further, following Noth's thesis of an Israelite amphictyony, it may have been the traditional gathering-place of the tribes (*Das System der Zwölfstämme Israels*). It is reasonable to accept the statement about the assembly, with Lods (*Israël*, 432), as against Stade (*GVI* 1, 344 f.) and Kittel (*GVI* 2, 219 f.), who regard the assembly at Shechem as primarily mutinous; but would not the king have taken proper military precautions? K. Möhlenbrink has attempted to review the city's ancient history in his article, "Sichem als altpalästinische Königsstadt," *Christentum u. Wissenschaft* 10 (1934), 125-34; cf. *ZAW* 1934, 129. Alt finds good historic background for the public declaration of blessing and curse in this locality; cf. Dt. 27, 28 (*Die Ursprünge des israel. Rechts*, 1934, 61 ff.). The ancient Shechem has been long identified with Balata, near Jacob's

Well, SE of modern Shechem.¹ The hereditary rights of the Davidic dynasty were not yet established,² and the discontented Northern tribes had now the opportunity of making their bargain with the new king. He postponed reply till the day after the morrow (*the third day*) for time to consult his counsellors; but he took the advice of his young companions, *the boys*, as the Hebrew means. The story phrases his reply in metrical form:

11. *My father loaded upon you a heavy yoke,
And I will add to your yoke;*
12. *My father chastised you with rods,
And I will chastise you with lashes.*

The last word—*scorpion* in Heb.—is technical for some kind of stinging whip. 15. The unfortunate decision of the young king is attributed to a '*sibbāh* from YHWH,' *i.e.*, as the root means, a *turn-about* of fate; the much later Koheleth marks this endless cycle in natural things (Eccl. 1^{3ff.}); the phrase is predestinarian, without moralizing as in the case of Abimelech's fate (Jud. 9⁵⁶). Hölscher claims that *sibbāh* is 'ein sehr junges Wort,' on what ground is not evident; rather the term belongs to ancient fatalism; *cf.* 2¹⁵. The following explication, *to establish his word which YHWH spake by Ahijah*, may itself be secondary. In any case Rehoboam's folly effected the divine purpose. 16. The v. repeats like a national anthem the lyric outcry of the earlier rebels against the dynasty (2 Sam. 20¹), with an additional line:

*What portion have we in David?
Neither have we inheritance in Jesse's son.
To your tents, O Israel!
Now see to thine own house, O David!*

¹ For earlier literature see Montg., *The Samaritans*, ch. 2. Excavations at Shechem have been pursued by German expeditions, in 1913-14 under Sellin, and since 1926; see Sellin's reports in *ZDPV* 1926 *seq.*, and a criticism of the later campaigns in *ZAW* 1933, 146 ff.; also G. Welter in *Archäologischer Anzeiger*, 1932, 292 ff. A fresh enterprise was undertaken in 1934 (*AJA* 1935, 142). See Albr., *APB* 55 ff.; Abel, *GP* 2, 458 ff.; Olmstead, *HPS* 285, with photographic plates.

² For the various interpretations of royal succession in the small states of the ancient Orient see Galling, *Die israelitische Staatsverfassung*, 12 ff.

“ To your tents ” smacks of the old Arabian life=English “ Go home ! ” “ See to thine own house ” (*cf.* Gen. 39²³) is in modern English, “ Look after your own business ! ” 18. 19. The stoning of Adoram, Over-the-Levy (the Adoniram of 4⁶—see Note), the energetic flight of the king, and the consummation of the rebellion are briefly narrated. As to the source of this narrative, which Hölscher characterizes as possessing ‘ all the traits of good old saga-narrative,’ critics differ. Wellhausen (in Bleek, *Einkl.*⁴, 243) and Hölscher regard it as Judæan; Kittel and Šanda, as Ephraimite. This variance of opinion reflects the pure objectivity of the story; nothing in the context exhibits any partiality for Jeroboam; according to 11^{37f.} he was given the opportunity ‘ to make good,’ while, with 12^{25ff.} he ‘ went wrong.’ On the other hand Rehoboam’s foolish political blunder is coolly narrated: it was divinely ‘ fated.’ Later a moral reason was found in Solomon’s infidelity, but it is not stated here, indeed his despotism goes unchallenged by the writer. The Judæan origin appears the more probable. This is supported, as Wellhausen holds (p. 277), by the correspondence of v. 16 with 2 Sam. 20¹.

21-24. The failure to suppress the revolt. The story is almost *ad verbum* identical with Ch. The latter ignored the earlier Ahijah narrative (except for casual references, II. 9²⁹, 10¹⁵) as quite too anti-dynastic, but it had to explain here why the rupture was not suppressed. The otherwise ignored tribe of Benjamin now appears. *Shemaiah the man of God* (the first appearance of the title in Ki.) appears to be a late fiction, appearing again in 2 Ch. 11^{2ff.}, 12^{5ff.}, and actually replacing Ahijah in the Gr. supplement, v. 24⁰. The figure of 180,000 *select warriors* (also in Ch.) is absurd; 6 has a lower figure, 120,000.

The Greek supplement to the history of Jeroboam, v. 24a-z. This addition in the OGrr., Old Latin (ignored by Josephus), was excised by the Hexaplaric recension, although still retained in some MSS of that later strain, *e.g.*, N. The following is a digest of its contents:

a=14²¹.—b. Jeroboam was son of a harlot, was ἀρχων σκντάλης, ‘ lash-master ’; he built Sareda for Solomon; he had 300 horse-chariots; he built the Akra by the levies of Ephraim; he shut up the City of David, rising against the

kingdom.—*c.* Solomon attempted to kill him; he fled to Shishak.—*d.* He heard of Solomon's death, and desired to return.—*e.* Parenthesis on his marriage to Shishak's sister-in-law (*cf.* the marriage of the Edomite prince Hadad, 11^{14ff.}).—*f.* His return; the tribe of Ephraim gathered to him; he built there a fort.—*g-na.* Sickness of his child, episode of Ahijah's prophecy, death of the child (*cf.* ch. 14).—*nβ.* He came to Shechem, and gathered the tribes there.—*o.* The prophecy of Shemaiah (*cf.* 11^{26ff.}).—*p et seq.* || 12¹⁻²⁴.

With its unique length as an insertion in the earlier books of the Septuagint, no passage has provoked a wider difference of opinion than this narrative, which is throughout contradictory of that in **H**. Distinguished historians have taken opposite positions (*cf.* Olmstead's citations, 'Source Study,' 15): von Ranke for the supplement as 'the earlier and more trustworthy of the two' (*Weltgeschichte*, 3, 2, 412); Meyer, on the contrary: "für jeden, der ohne vorgefasste Meinung den Sachverhalt prüft, kann die Priorität des hebräischen Berichts und die gänzliche Wertlosigkeit der daraus zurechtgemachten Erzählung von LXX auch hier nicht zweifelhaft sein" (*IN* 369 f.). Biblical critics are as sharply polarized. Says Stade: "The Hebrew text from which **G** was translated had after this verse a *midrash* describing Jeroboam's life and adventures. This late addition is rather fanciful and very clumsily compiled from elements in the narratives of **A**, in cc. 11, 12, 14" (*SBOT* 130); to which Olmstead replies: "When scholars of such deserved reputation can take this attitude, it is clear that a somewhat detailed examination of this 'midrash' is demanded if we are to free the Jeroboam narrative from this reproach. That it forms a well-balanced, consistent, and probable story can best be shown by allowing the narrator to speak in his own words"—there follows a full translation (*AJSL* 30 [1913], 17; *cf. ib.*, 31 [1915], 169 ff.; *HPS* 350). Cheyne takes similar position (*JQR* 1899, 551 ff., and art. 'Jeroboam' in *EB*). Definitely on the other side stand, *inter al.*, Kuenen, *Einl.*, 1, 2, 97, n. 10, Kittel in his *Comm.*, and Burney, pp. 163 ff. Benzinger mediately holds that **G** has preserved what **H** has lost (pp. 82, 86 f.); and Šanda pursues an elaborate criticism, separating the older body of the narrative from the later accretions (pp. 375 ff.).

Skinner in his short Commentary has given an admirable critique of the question (Note II, pp. 443 ff.) ; to the problem as to which of the two accounts is the more original he finds it impossible to give a decided answer ; the present form of **Ⓒ**, he holds, does not compare well with **Ⓓ**, but, and here in line with Šanda, when the former text is cleared of excrescences, there remains a kernel whose inferiority to **Ⓓ** is by no means obvious. Also Robinson in his presentation (*HI* I, 270 ff.) is dubious as between the two.

The present writer agrees with the negative judgment. He holds in brief that when the text of **Ⓓ** is cleared of the interpolations indicated above, there remains an abbreviated but clear story of Jeroboam ; the latter had fled to Egypt, there followed upon Solomon's death the conclave at Shechem and the revolt of the North, and then, when the Northerners heard that the capable Jeroboam had returned in the interregnum, they offered him the crown. One disturbance indeed in the sequence is that the long story of Ahijah's prophecy (*II*²⁹⁻³⁹) dovetails awkwardly between the introduction, "and this is the story how J. raised his hand against king S." (*v.*²⁷), and the sequel, "and so S. sought to kill him" (*v.*⁴⁰). But the supplement presents a motive for Solomon's hostility, alleging that Jeroboam had three hundred chariots, and that "he was exalting himself against the *régime*" (*cf.* Num. 16³). This may be index that the need of a motivation was early felt and supplied. But, as Meyer observes, no nobleman in Solomon's day could have acted in such high-handed fashion ; Absalom's pomp (2 Sam. 15¹) was child's play in comparison. It is evident that the whole animus of the story is against Jeroboam ; his mother was a harlot, and he was high-handed from the beginning ; he had no original prophetic auspices, but Ahijah appears on the scene to predict his child's death as penalty for the abominations he will one day commit—a story arrantly transplanted hither from ch. 14. Ahijah's oracle, as given by **Ⓓ**, is put in the mouth of the almost fictitious Shemaiah (*v.*²⁴⁰), while the favourable conditional promise is omitted. To make the subject more interesting Jeroboam is given the part at Shishak's court which a most reliable and original document gives to the Edomite prince ; a Pharaoh would not have given his daughter to a commoner.

There is in **Ⓔ** none of the cool objectivity of the story in **Ⓓ**, which may well be Judæan in origin, but which passes no judgment upon Jeroboam in advance, rather offers him God-given opportunity. The supplement in a word is midrashic, rather a jumble to an extent that does not appear until the Chronicler, which fact may not exclude the presence of detached items of tradition. As the supplement harks back to the early form of **Ⓓ**, it may serve at times for text-correction; but any judgment in accepting definite historical data must be arbitrary. The general opinion that the original was Hebrew is doubtless correct, and for that reason it is of literary interest as index of the extent of such literature at an early date—we may compare the midrashic stories in Josephus. The translators of **Ⓔ** simply attached it to their 'unauthorized' translation of the Scriptures as a variant historical document of interest, one which made of Jeroboam a more sinister person than did the sober history preserved in **Ⓓ**. See further Comm. on 14^{1ff.}.

V.²⁵-14²⁰. The reign of Jeroboam. Cf. 2 Ch. 11¹³⁻¹⁵, 13¹⁻²⁰; *Ant.*, viii, 8, 4-9, 4.

25. *And Jeroboam built (i.e., rebuilt) Shechem in the Highland of Ephraim, and resided in it. And he went out from there, and built Penuel.* The v. is of archival origin, and is the only purely secular datum, except 14²⁰, preserved for Jeroboam's reign. Shishak's invasion must have affected the young Northern kingdom even more than Judah, and hence the paucity of data. Penuel across the Jordan on the Jabbok (Gen. 32³², etc.; cf. Abel, *GP* 2, 406) may be one of the places (no. 53) listed by Shishak among his conquests (see Comm., 14^{25ff.}). Lods (*Israël*, 434) and Olmstead (*HPS* 355) propose that Penuel was built by Jeroboam upon Shishak's retreat from his invasion. The object of this military undertaking was doubtless the control of the trade-routes across Jordan with the intention of usurping Judah's heritage. The verb 'to go out' is used of military campaigns. There is no reason to think, with Stade (*GVI* 1, 351) and Lods, that a new capital was attempted. Only indirectly do we learn of another royal seat, Tirzah (14¹⁷, 15³³, etc.).

VV.²⁶⁻³¹. Jeroboam's religious innovations. The history of the reign is composed of this late popular tradition and two prophetic stories, v.³²-ch. 13, and 14¹⁻¹⁸. Critics differ widely

upon the analysis of these few verses. Kittel regards vv.²⁶⁻²⁷ as secondary, Stade only v.²⁸, while Hölischer, in addition to numerous minor points speaks of vv.³¹⁻³³ as 'Flickwerk.' **28. 29.** Confusion occurs over the two calves. Jeroboam made two calves of gold, then proclaimed, *Behold thy gods, O Israel, who brought thee up from the land of Egypt*, and finally he placed the one at Bethel and the other at Dan. With only one calf there was danger of confusion of the image with ΥHWH ; with the introduction of a second one the worship in the Northern Kingdom is presented as clearly polytheistic. Accordingly the present text is a development of the original tradition that he set up a calf at Bethel, concerning which he would have proclaimed, *This is thy God who brought [reading sing. verb] thee*, etc., exactly as at Neh. 9¹⁸, although at Ex. 32⁴⁻⁸ the sing. has been changed into the pl., "these are thy gods." The similar spirit of correction appears in the text of Hos. 10⁵, where with Gr. 'the calves (of Beth-aven)' is to be restored to 'the calf.' **30a.** *And this thing became a sin*: an evident interpolation from 13³⁴. **30b.** *And the people went before the one as far as Dan*: an awkward statement in the context, as translators have seen from early days. \mathfrak{L} adds the desiderated complement, 'and before the other to Bethel,' and Oort, Kittel, Burney, *BH* would still further improve the text by inserting this Lucianic addition before the 'going to Dan.' Kamphausen boldly rewrites the whole passage; Benzinger and Šanda unnecessarily find in the statement a cultic procession 'before the calf' from Bethel to Dan for its installation there, comparing 2 Sam. 6.³ The indictment is further continued: **31.** *He made the houses of the high-places*, and he instituted a new order of priests, *not of the sons of Levi*, but *from the whole range of the people*. The last phrase is to be so translated, and not as *from the lowest of the people*, with AV, following a Renaissance interpretation, e.g., 'ex fæce populi.' And yet the high-places had not been destroyed nor the local priest-guilds abolished; but neither is such a reformation attributed to David and Solomon.

The nature of these alleged religious 'innovations' of Jeroboam has long been recognized by historians as reaction

³ Jos. still knew of 'the temple of the golden calf above the Little Jordan' (*BJ* iv, 1, 1).

against the growing dominance of Solomon's temple in Jerusalem, which was at once the religious expression of his autocratic claims: see for example Stade, *GVI* 1, 351 ff.; Kittel, *GVI* 2, 301 ff.; Robinson, *HI* 1, 277 ff. There is nothing to show that Solomon repressed the local cults; but his ambition to make Jerusalem supreme, in the double aspect of political and religious capital, tended inevitably to the depreciation of the provincial holy places, to the political irritation of the local communities and the tribes at large, and to the relative depression of the country priests, who doubtless came to play the rôle of agitators against the family of Sadok. It was these elements of opposition to which as a clever politician Jeroboam made his appeal. However, reaction in itself has no positive value. The fact stands forth that the cult at Jerusalem contained positive elements of good, in its imagelessness and freedom from depraved practices, and for its position in the capital, where excesses were checked by a restrained culture and a political control. The part played by princes in religious advance and reformation is often overlooked; it is well exhibited in the subsequent history of Judah. Religion is generally of a higher character in cities than in country communities, among the 'pagani,' to use the ancient Christian term for the heathen of the countryside, and similarly Teutonic 'heathen,' 'Heiden.' At all events this reaction boded no good for the North, as its weakness through its several dynasties proved. Jeroboam's enterprise was purely political, indeed cleverly founded on the opposition to Solomon's autocracy and centralization of religion. But he had no religious interest beyond the restoration of the local cults (*ye have gone up long enough to Jerusalem*), and this policy, in contrast to the history of Judah, worked ill for the unity of the North. Olmstead indeed remarks as follows (*HPS* 353): "Jeroboam's revolt was no revolt against Yahweh's cult. If not instigated by the prophetic party, it met with their approval, and history proves that they were right. During the centuries which immediately followed, every fundamental advance in Hebrew religion originated in the north." But the prophetic guilds and prophets of the North had no association with the local cults; they represented a reaction against the debasing tendencies of Canaanitism, which were not so

active in the more unified South, where the temple in Jerusalem stood for the sober national religion.

The *calves* (depreciatory for 'bulls'?—*cf.* the 'she-calves' of Hos. 10⁵) are generally regarded as aboriginal to the Israelite cult; see Nowack, *Arch.*, 2, 23; but Benzinger (*Arch.*, 326) observes that 'surprisingly enough' Palestinian archæology has found only small god-images; *cf.* Kittel (*GVI* 2, 61, notes 2, 3), who would reduce the bull to the function of bearer of the deity. Against the general view Eissfeldt ('Der Gott Bethel,' *ARw.*, 1930) argues that the calf-worship was introduced by Jeroboam and was not original, and similarly Meek holds that he introduced another religion (*Hebrew Origins*, 158 ff.).⁴ For Bethel, in addition to the standard authorities, see now the reports of the American School's excavations at modern Beitin by Albright, *BASOR* nos. 55, 56, 57 (1934-35), and Abel, *GP* 2, 270. For Dussaud's view that Bethel meant originally a deity and not a place, and that this fact has been deleted here (*Origines cananéennes du sacrifice israélite*, 1921, 69 f., 234 ff.) see Kittel's criticism, p. 230, n. 2. *The houses of the high-places* may refer simply to the rock-hewn sacred precincts, as at Gezer, which were themselves 'houses of deity'; or for possible architectural construction in the sacred areas may be compared G. L. Robinson's description of a high-place at Petra, and hard by "outlines of what once was probably a roofed-in guest chamber or hall, in which sacrificial feasts may have been celebrated" (*Sarcophagus of an Ancient Civilization*, 140, *cf.* 154 ff.).

1. **בא** : original, and so **ב^ח**; 10 MSS **בא** = OGr., Ch.—2. **אשר** : = 'where,' from the original mng., 'place'; *cf.* Ps. 41⁹; see C. Gaenssle, 'The Heb. Particle אשר,' *AJSL* 31 (1914), 15 ff. (not noting these cases).—**הבקר** ש' : so the order by earlier usage, 1¹,

⁴ The bull was the holy animal over a widespread area; see art. 'Stier' in Pauly-Wissowa, *RE*, esp. col. 2503 *seq.*, 2512 *seq.*; for Canaan, L. Waterman, 'Bull-Worship in Israel,' *AJSL* 31 (1915), 229 ff.; S. A. Cook, *The Religion of Anc. Palestine*, 27 ff. For its vogue in S. Arabian sacred art see A. Grohmann, *Göttersymbole u. Symboltiere auf süd-arab. Denkmälern*, 1914, 41, 65 ff. 'The bull of El' now appears in the Ugaritic texts. Albright (*From the Stone Age*, 228 ff.) supports at length Kittel's position. Art has had its part in the deterioration of religion, the sign becoming the thing signified, and hence the drastic Second Commandment.

etc.; many MSS reverse the order with Ch.—וַיִּשָׁבֵב ' במצרים: read 'וַיִּשָׁבֵב ' כַּמֵּ' see Comm.—3. וַיִּבְאוּ Kt., וַיִּבְאוּ Kṛ.=17 MSS: the latter correct; cf. Note, v.¹.—5. עָרָה: VSS, exc. T, as עָרָה; such correction is not required, vs. BH.—הָעָם: Grr. om.; probably insertion from Ch.—6. וַיִּוֹעַן: there is no reason for emendation on basis of Gr., for which see presentation in BH.—וַרְבֵּעַם: OGrr. om., as unnecessary, as also St. holds; similar variations in v.¹⁸.—וַיִּדְבֹר ' את פִּי שֵׁ': for the prepositional phrase see GB 641b.—7. וַיִּדְבֹר Kt., וַיִּדְבֹר Kṛ.: Kt. case of ancient 'defective spelling,' or impersonal?—וַעֲבֹדְתֶם וַעֲנִיתֶם וַרְבֵּרְתֶם: T om. the second verb, prob. through misunderstanding of it as implying 'humility'; T^L T^H tr., with the verb ἐλκεῖν, 'to yield.' Ch. found similar objection to the preceding verb, rendering it with רָחַם לִמְנוּחַ, and changing וַעֲבֹדְתֶם to וַרְצִיתֶם; see St. and Haupt for attempted simplifications.—8. אִיִּר ' אִיִּר: for the syntax of the phrase cf. 21¹¹; Ch. om. אִיִּר, and so BH; but cf. מִמֶּךָ אִיִּר אֵשׁ מִשָּׁל in the Eshmunazar inscr., line 9.—9. נָשִׁיב=Ch.; VSS as sing., as appropriate to the royal ego; but the case is one of the 'communicative plural'; cf. Gen. 1²⁸, Is. 6⁸, and see Haupt.—10. אַתָּה: Grr., a duplicate, טַט טַט, as presenting 'א' and 'א'; 1 MS reads the latter. טַט טַט: acc. to St., al., it is far preferable to read טַט טַט, cf. v.⁴; but why the variation from the obvious? Some MSS spell the preceding case with טַט טַט.—קָטַנְתִּי: so Ginsb.², BH; other edd., קָטַנְתִּי.—12. וַיָּבֹאוּ Kt., וַיָּבֹאוּ Kṛ., MSS וַיָּבֹאוּ; T as pl.; the sing. is to be kept, as in vv.¹.³.²¹.—15. יְהוָה 2⁰: 2 MSS, OGrr. om.—16. יִשְׂרָאֵל: correct, vs. 'the people' of T^L T^H.—דָּבַר: 3 MSS, Ch., OGrr. om.—מָה: in the negative sense, like Arab. mā; see GB 401b.—וַיִּשְׁבֹּר: one of the 18 *Tikhkūnē Sōferim*, this case being alleged to be correction of לַאלֹהִים, 'to thy gods'; see Ginsb., *Int.*, 355 f., Dr. on 2 Sam. 20¹.—רָאָה: Grr., βρασκε=רָאָה (accepted by Then., al.); T^L a plus at end of v., κρινε/ναι, 'choose'=Aram. רָעָה, 'to delight in'; T על, by periphrasis.—18. הָרָחֵם=Ch.; Gr. texts with various forms; Jos.=T^H; OGrr. revised to 'Adoniram,' which is accepted by Kit., Burn., St., BH; but see Note on 4⁶.—יִשְׂרָאֵל: B a₂ om.; cf. Note, v.¹⁸.—20. וַיִּרְבַּעַם: B*† Ροβοαμ.—[יִשְׂרָאֵל] 2⁰: Grr. om.—יְהוּדָה: Grr. + 'and Benjamin,' despite לבָּנוּ.—22. הָאֱלֹהִים: read יְהוָה with 4 MSS, Ch.=VSS.—24. וַיִּשְׁבוּ לְלִבָּת: for the phrase='returned' cf. 13¹⁷, etc.; for the first word Grr., καταπαυσαν, as though for וַיִּשְׁבֹּרוּ, and so BH 'fortasse.'—26. 'in his heart': the same phrase used of the fool's blasphemy, Ps. 53².—27. הוּא 2⁰: OGrr. om.—אֲרִיֵּהם: Grr. (exc. i a₂), Κυριον κ. κυριον αυτου.—5 MSS om.—וַיִּשְׁבוּ וְנָוִ: OGrr. om.—28. הַמֶּלֶךְ: so most Gr. MSS, but T^H with ⋆; N om.; T^L 'Jeroboam' (and so adding in v.³¹); the subject is an intrusion.—אֱלֹהִים: Grr. as for הָעָם, which BH, al. prefer, but St. rejects; the Gr. would clarify the reference of the pronoun.—רַב לִבָּם מַעֲלֹת: see Burn., GK §133, c.—הַעֲלוּ: on basis of argument above read the sing., הַעֲלֵה, with Kit., St., al. (BH with question).—30. לְהַטָּא: T^L + 'to

Israel' (confining the sin to the North), which Burn., *BH* adopt. — ער הן : OGr. + ' and before the other to Bethel'; see Comm.—*Sub fin.*, a plus in some Gr. minuscc., and noted in marg. of ⚙^H "and they left the house of the Lord."—31. את : to be deleted with Burn., *BH*.—בית בנות : for the composite pl. phrase *cf.* II. 17^{29, 32}, and see GK §124, 1 : *per contra*, 'בתי הב', 13³².—קצות : see GB *s.v.*; a sing. from *ḥaṣawal*; *cf.* the Aramaizing קצת, *e.g.*, Dan. 1², and see Montg. *ad loc.*

12³²-13. Jeroboam's presumptuous impiety; the penalty pronounced by the word of a man of God; the sequel of the latter's sad fate; Jeroboam's recalcitrancy and the inevitable doom of the dynasty. Critics differ as to the alignment of vv.^{32, 33}, which themselves contain duplicate material. *E.g.*, Kittel, Benzinger attach v.³² to the preceding narrative, and Burney and Skinner include also v.³³. But the fresh story begins with v.³², as recognized by Stade, Šanda. Its theme is independent of the notes of the cults of the high-places; Jeroboam is punished for usurpation of priestly prerogative. The unravelling of the duplicates is also a problem. A simple narrative is obtained by accepting as the original introduction to the story these two elements: v.^{32a}, *And Jeroboam made a pilgrimage-feast* [Heb.=Arab. *haj*] *in the eighth month like the feast that is in Judah*; and v.³³ (*ad finem*), *And he went up upon the altar to burn incense*. The intervening redactional material was introduced to round out and emphasize Jeroboam's innovations before the story of the man of God: his acting as priest, sacrificing to the calves (here both at Bethel!), institution of priests of high-places, and notably, v.^{33a}, the gratuitous condemnation of the assumed heretical innovation of a new date for the Haj, of which condemnation there is no breath in v.³²—it was *like the feast that is in Judah*. This summary completes the indictment of Jeroboam, and serves as introduction to the story of the man of God. The alleged innovation of the date of the Haj has been most variously interpreted. Some scholars have assumed that the eighth month was the original dating of Sukkoth, at least in North Palestine, as more agreeable to its climate, and hence the assignment of the seventh month for the Judæan practice would be an innovation which became standardized in the later Law; so Kittel, *cf.* Benzinger. But Dalman (*A. u. S.*, 2, 41; *cf.* p. 121, etc., and *cf.* Sanda) takes direct

issue with Kittel, noting that between Jerusalem and Samaria there is no difference of harvest time—if climatic difference there be, Samaria is warmer than Judah—there may have been a variance of opinion as to the conclusion of harvest, *e.g.*, the olive harvest coming latest. The problem is connected with that of the apparent conflict between the date of the completion of the temple in Bul, the eighth month (6³⁸), and the dedication in Ethanim, the seventh month (8²). See the discussion in connexion with the latter passage, and note Morgenstern's solution. Then Jeroboam would have been following the old Israelite practice, *like the feast that is in Judah* (and so Mowinkel, *Chronologie*, 174). But the later Judæan calendar, which threw that festival wholly into the seventh month, was the innovation, while the North retained the old calendar. The distinction of the celebrations may have been further accentuated, as is the wont of sectarian divisions, and this may be the basis of the condemnatory remark, *on the fifteenth day in the eighth month, in the month which he had invented by himself* (see Note), and then the day-date may have been clumsily introduced into v.³²; *cf.* Morgenstern, p. 69, n. 93, holding these day-dates to be very late glosses. The crowning presumption was, according to the narrator, that *he went up on* (the place of) *the altar to burn incense*; this is the late criticism of the ancient prerogative of monarchy; see Comm. on 8^{14ff.}.

13¹⁻³². The story of the nameless *man of God*, as the hero is entitled throughout, is the first extensive case of midrash in the historical books, to be continued *in extenso* in the later stories of the prophets, and is for that reason of literary interest. Ch. names as authority for the reign of Rehoboam's son Abijah 'the Midrash of the Prophet Iddo' (II. 13²²), which compilation may have contained the present story. Later development gave this prophet's name to the present man of God; so Jos., with Yadon, and Rabbinic tradition (see Marcus). Even the ultra-conservative Keil dodged the explicit *vaticinium post eventum* of the name Josiah (v.²); he held that the man of God pronounced the name as an 'appellative,' 'he whom Y. supports,' subsequently providentially fulfilled in the actual name, and similar, as he holds, to the prediction of Cyrus's name in Isaiah, these then being the

only cases of such explicit prediction in the Scriptures. The relation of the story to that of Josiah's cognizance of 'the man of God's sepulchre' (II. 23^{16ff.}) has been disputed. Wellhausen claims (*Comp.*, 277) the literary dependence of our story upon that history; but Thenius's recognition of that passage as an interpolation from our story is to be accepted. It is impossible to date the documentary fixation of such a legend; with Šanda, the redaction would have taken place in Josiah's time. There is indeed no particular indication of late post-Exilic date; the reference to the 'cities of Samaria' (v.³²) can be pre-Exilic. Interest in such prophets did not continue after the Exile. There may be noted the peculiar, evidently popular term *man of God* (the later Christian 'divine') for the Judæan over against the Northern title *prophet* (*cf.* vv.¹⁻¹¹). The repeated and apparently redundant phrase, *by the word of YHWH*, has been noted by Wellhausen as late; but see Note, v.¹. The probable fact is that among the sepulchres that Josiah destroyed was the tomb of an unnamed Judæan holy man, celebrated with a legend; *cf.* Arabic *wali*. There is to be noted the dramatic feature of the lion which remained *standing by the carcass* (v.²⁵), for its preservation until it came into the prophet's pious hands; similarly a lion figures in the case of a man who disobeyed a prophet (20^{35ff.}); for the nuisance of lions in Palestine see *Comm.* on II. 17^{25f.}. The story has its moral in the theme of the disobedient prophet; *cf.* the Balaam story and that of Jonah. It is true to religious psychology; the man of God's errand is to be devoted singly to the divine purpose; *cf.* the word of Jesus, Luke 10⁴. No punishment is entailed upon the lying prophet, who subsequently became the medium of the true word of God, on which fact Grotius curtly remarks, "Revelatio prophetica sæpe fit malis hominibus." But his history is not the point of the story, while in any case false inspiration of the prophets was a matter of common knowledge, and was given its explanation as coming from a 'lying spirit' (22^{20ff.}). Indeed in the latter story Micaiah gives first a false oracle (v.¹⁵). It is to be noted that the old prophet ascribes his inspiration to *an angel* (v.¹⁸), which at least relieves the divine responsibility. Šanda holds that the final staccato sentence, *he lied to him*, is an interpolation. The legend developed to

explain the untimely end of some holy man upon his return from a mission ; he must have committed some fault on the way. The narrative is diffuse, and the text is subject to much criticism and correction. In v.¹¹ is to be read the pl., *his sons came*, with the VSS ; in v.¹² *and they showed him*, for the make-shift translation, *for they had seen*. At end of v.²³ the words appearing in EVV as *to wit* (or *namely*), *for the prophet whom he had brought back*, are to be elided, as erroneous gloss to define the preceding subject. V.^{29b} on the basis of $\text{\textcircled{E}}$ may be simplified ; in v.³¹ in place of *lay my bones beside his bones*, the Grr. read, *lay me*, etc. ; see Notes.

In vv.^{33. 34} as sequel to the above story and with repetition of 12³¹ Jeroboam's incorrigible perversity is depicted. Wellhausen (*Comp.*, 278), followed by Stade, regards v.^{33a} as continuation of that story, and vv.^{33b. 34} as redactorial ; it is simpler, with Šanda, to consider both vv. as redactorial with emphasis on the illegitimate priesthood. The usual translation of v.³³ is that *he again made priests*, an obscure note indeed ; the meaning of the Heb. verbs is rather : *he turned back and made priests*, since he was now proved to be physically incapacitated. For such use of the first verb cf. II. 24¹, Jer. 34^{11. 16}. The bastard priesthood is here the object of denunciation, as the calves were at 12³⁰. Some minor corrections of the Heb. text are to be noted (see Notes). At end of v.³³ read : *he would consecrate him, and he would become a high-place priest* (EVV paraphrase). In v.³⁴ correct by *this thing*, and read with MSS, VSS, EVV exc. JV : *this thing became the sin of the house of Jeroboam* ; critics vary as to the interpretation, some preferring the Gr., " and this thing became a sin to the house of J." The terse Hebrew at end of the same v. may be literally translated : *and to* (the end of) *abolition and destruction from off the earth* ; the second phrase occurs at Dt 6¹⁵, Am. 9⁸. The phrase translated 'to consecrate' is literally 'to fill the hand of,' as used in the ritual of consecration, Ex. 28⁴¹, etc. ; it was however of ancient usage, appearing in the story of Micah's consecration of the Levite (Jud. 17^{5. 12}). Exactly the same phrase occurs in Akk. *mullū (ana) kātā*, of the solemn placing of the sceptre in the new king's hand (in Hammurabi's case, *KB* 3, 1, 122), not however of sacred functions. See the full discussions by Nowack (*Arch.*,

2, 120 ff.) and Šanda. Šanda argues convincingly that the term denotes the assignment of the benefice to the priest, some symbol being used in the rite of 'filling the hand.' The term is originally secular, not necessarily of Mesopotamian origin. Compare the history of the Muslim term for the election of the caliph, *bai'at*, literally 'purchase-contract,' accompanied with the handshake, a term that passed into the Syriac Churches for the consecration of the higher clergy. In the Anglican Church the key of the church is placed in the hand of the newly instituted rector.

32. כן : Grr. the relative δ , by correction of a careless passage.—והעמיר : again a case of dialectical or late syntax.—33. בבית אל : om.—2⁰ בחרש : Grr., *εν τη εορτη*.—כרא מלבר : the verb has the Arab. sense, 'to invent, improvise'; comparison with Neh. 6⁸, מלכך אתה בודא, "for out of thy heart thou art inventing them" (*i.e.*, the preceding 'words'), early induced the \aleph . here, קלבו (also in MSS), as also early known to the Grr. with *απο καρδιας αυτου*, a correction generally accepted by critics; but the point is that he invented the new dating 'all by himself' = קלבו.

Ch. 13. 1. ברבר (יהוה) : also vv. 2. 5. 9. 17. 18, 20³⁵, 1 Sam. 3²¹. The cryptic character of the expression appears in the variety of translations: EVV in general, 'in the word,' GV 'durch das Wort,' FV 'avec la parole,' Chic. B., 'at the command,' Moff., 'moved by'; the last rendering approaches closest to the supernatural idea involved, and so Šanda, 'Kraft göttlicher Eingebung.' The expression appears to be rather overworked in the narrative, *e.g.*, v. 17, but it is a bit of religious diction. For the term see the excellent discussion by Smend, *Lehrbuch der alttest. Rel.-gesch.* (1899), 87, with the initial statement: "das Wort Jahves ist früh als eine göttliche Potenz gedacht," and now the recent particular studies by F. Haeussermann, *Wortempfang in der alttest. Prophetie*, ZAW Beih. 58 (1932), esp. pp. 122 ff.; O. Grether, *Name u. Wort Gottes im A.T.*, ZAW Beih. 64 (1934), Teil II; L. Dürr, *Die Wertung des göttl. Wortes im A.T. u. im Antiken Orient*, MVÄG 42, Heft 1 (1938). For the Bab. parallels see KAT 608, n. 2. Probably 'invested with the word,' *i.e.*, in the divine aura, would best express the notion, which is equivalent to *ἐν δυνάμει πνεύματος* of the N.T., *e.g.*, Rom. 15¹⁹. In 1 Sam. 3²¹ the phrase is used as a gloss to ease up the too physical assertion that "YHWH appeared to Samuel."—2. ויאמר : B† om.—שמן : for the idiom, frequent in Aram., *cf.* 1 Sam. 17⁴, etc.—ישראל : impers. pl.; Grr., \aleph \aleph change to sing.—3. הנה המטה נקרע : the ppl. = 'delendum est,' hence followed by perf. ונשפך (*vs.* Šanda).—4. ירבעם : to be omitted with \aleph ; \aleph \aleph \aleph intrude 'the king.'—6. ויען : והתפלל בערי.—OGrr., \aleph \aleph 'and said the king Jer.'

א om. ; prob. a gloss to the preceding antique and anthropomorphic phrase (cf. Engl. 'curry favour').—7. וַיִּקְצֶרָה : so BH with MSS C L, accepted by Ginsb.², vs. וַיִּקְצֶרָה, on which cf. Burn. ; the verb is used absolutely as in LHeb., otherwise + לָבָא.—8. מַתָּה : the noun is otherwise late in Heb.—9. [צוּה אִרְי (בְּדַבַּר י') : the Grr. generally obtained a subject by rdg. the foll. gen. κυριου as nom. κυριος, but MSS e f y preserve the original genitive. The text has been commonly emended (e.g., by St., BH) to צוּיַתִּי, and then consequently בְּקֵרִי is read in v.¹⁷ ; but the two are cases of the impersonal sing. used in language of religious mystery ; cf. בניר, Zech. 9¹², and see Ew., *Lehrb.*, §294, 1 (2), who cft. N.T. λεγει ; the text is to be kept.—10. הָרַךְ אִרְי : the noun construed as masc. (cf. v.¹²) ; in the foll. אִשֶּׁר בָּא בָהּ the fem. prepositional phrase is an intrusion with contradictory gender ; cf. בְּרִדְךָ אִשֶּׁר הִלַּכְתָּ, v.⁹.—11. אִרְי = Engl. 'a certain' ; frequent in N. Pal. narratives and LHeb. ; see Burn., pp. 181, 209, GB 23a.—12. וַיִּבְרָא בְּנוֹ וַיִּסְפְּרוּ : Ken. 30 וַיִּבְרָא בְּנוֹ וַיִּסְפְּרוּ = VSS, exc. C, and correct.—13. הַיּוֹם : 'on that day' ; cf. Arab. equivalent = 'to-day.'—14. וְאֵת אֵת : 2 MSS וְאֵת = some Grr., VSS (exc. C), accepted by Then., BH, al ; St. regards אֵת to the end of the verse as secondary ; it is simpler to read וְאֵת, and to take וַיִּסְפְּרוּ וְגו' as secondary. For this last verb Grr. read remarkably וַיִּסְפְּרוּ בְּנֵיהֶם.—15. אִרְיָהּ : OGrr. + λεγει ; 1 MS replaces with וַיִּרְאוּ. read Hif., וַיִּרְאוּ, with C ; cf. similar absolute use in Est. 1⁴ ; other VSS with obj., as though וַיִּרְאוּ.—16. הָאֵלֶּה : for the picturesque use of the determinate noun see GK §126, 4.—17. הַיְהִיָּה : there is no reason to omit the word, with OGrr., and so St. ; the phrase = Engl. "come home with me."—18. וַלְבוֹא אֵתְךָ : 2 MSS, OGrr. om., and so St., BH ; but S with plus בֵּיתְךָ offers the true mng., 'à entrer chez toi.'—19. [אִשֶּׁרְתָּה אֵתְךָ] : OGrr. om., and so St., BH ; in the parallel, v.¹⁷, St. also om. שָׁם.—20. וַיִּקְרַךְ : Grr., S, as passive, and so EVV translate ; it is easy to correct with many critics to the Pual ; but the Pual is rare, occurring only twice ; see Note, v.⁹.—21. [תִּשְׁבוּ] : ca. 50 MSS וְלֵא = VSS.—22. לֵלֵכְתָּ : St. finds superfluous, arguing from Gr. επιστρεψης, but this is correct translation of the Heb. verbs, 'to return.'—23. כְּהַשָּׁה : circumstantial, 'lying to him' ; cf. Dr., *Tenses*, §163.—24. וַיִּשָּׁב אִרְי : = Engl. "and he turned in with him" ; read by OGrr. as וַיִּשָּׁב אִתּוֹ.—25. אֵל [הַשִּׁלְחָן] : read על with 19 MSS ; cf. 2 Sam. 9¹¹.—N.b. the 'pishah-in-middle-of-verse,' a long spacing, in this case giving dignity to the foll. statement ; a similar case II. 1¹⁷ ; see Graetz, *MGWJ* 27 (1878), 481 ff. ; 36 (1887), 193 ff.—26. פִּי י' : C reduced the anthropomorphism with 'the word of Y.'—27. וְאִרְי שְׁתוּוֹ : Grr. + 'water,' accepted by BH ; but, with St., the whole phrase is unnecessary.—28. לְבִיבֵי אִשֶּׁר הִשְׁבִּינוּ : this vague phrase is not represented in OGrr. exc. for the verb κ. επιστρεψεν, which emendation is accepted by Burn., BH. Hex. then inserted in place τω προφητη. But לְבִיבֵי is an erroneous gloss to explain the ethical dative לוֹ, לְבִיבֵי being misunderstood as action of the host, and then was

added "who brought him back," but the guest is never called 'the prophet.' St. properly rejects the whole phrase.—**24.** The root מצא includes the mng. of Aram. כַּמֵּי, 'to chance upon' = Eth. *mase'a*; in v.²⁸ it means 'to find.'—**25.** 2 Ⓢ^L MSS om. through the הבלה 2^o; 1 MS Ken. om. through ויבאו.—**26b-27.** OGrr. om.; BH as 'probably an addition'; rather the Gr. is an abbreviation, and so St. decides.—**28.** והמור : 12 MSS והמור=Grr., and to be accepted.—**29.** אל 1^o : 12 MSS correctly על=Grr.—**29b.** OGrr. offer a simpler text, omitting ויבא, rdg. as though אל העיר (so 1 Heb. MS), retaining הנביא (as nom.), omitting [ולקברו]; the simplest revision is וישבהו אל העיר לקברו with St.; cf. Burn.—**30b.** ויטפדו : the pl. of community action, and so recognized by Ⓢ, but Ⓢ^L and Ⓢ^M MSS tr. with sing. (so 1 Heb. MS), induced by 'my brother.'—הוי אחי : fuller statements of the mourning cry appear in Jer. 22¹⁸, 34⁶, cf. Am. 5¹⁶, and also OGr., 12^{24m}, for which passage see Note, 14¹³. Šanda cf. similar dirges in the modern Lebanon, beginning with "Ah, my dear one, ah, my friend."—**31.** אחריו קברו אהו : Grr., 'after (his) bewailing him,' a sophisticated improvement. הניחו את עצמותי : Grr., 'me' for the obj., i.e., אחי, which is preferable (a living man would hardly have used the other expression), with which cf. II. 23¹⁸; Grr. were affected by the parallel account and added "that my bones be saved with his bones," which addition is accepted by St. and BH (*q.v.*).—**32.** כל : Grr. om.—בערי שמוון : Grr., 'in Samaria.'—**33.** שדרכו רעה : Grr. as though רעתו, ימלא : potential imperf., and not to be corrected; see GK §159, d. 2^o : read the sing. with VSS, with antecedent in ההפץ; the pl. was induced by the preceding pl.—**34.** בדבר : read הדבר with 7 MSS=VSS, exc. Ⓢ. להצאת בית : Grr., Ⓢ^M Ⓢ as though להצאת לב' ; Ⓢ is to be retained, with St., vs. Burn., BH; the same phrase, with correction of text, at II. 13⁶.

14¹⁻¹⁸. The prophet Ahijah, besought by Jeroboam's wife, who goes in disguise on behalf of their sick son, predicts his immediate death, and elaborates at length the doom upon Jeroboam's family. The story belongs to the same collection as that of the Old Prophet, ch. 13. It fails here in the OGrr. But the Hexaplaric texts (*e.g.*, A c₂ Ⓢ^M with ⋄) have inserted it here in a form variant from Ⓢ, and of this variant the OGrr. preserve a variant form in 12^{24g-n}. For this Gr. supplement see Comm. after 12²⁴. The judgment passed there on its secondary and worthless character as a primary document is maintained here for this particular story. An absolute choice must be made between the two stories. In Ⓢ the prophet Ahijah is well known as the predictor of Jeroboam's fortunes; but in the supplement he must be named and

described (vv.^{24h.1}) as a man of 60 years and of poor eyesight, while in the original story he was vigorous enough to accost Jeroboam 'alone in the open country' (11²⁹). The supplement definitely ignored Ahijah's earlier prophecy in order to turn him into a prophet of doom *ab origine*, and assigned that duty to Shemaiah who appears later in \mathfrak{H} , in a truncated, apparently unfinished passage (v.^{24o}). In a word the historical tragedy presented in \mathfrak{H} , the auspicious oracle to Jeroboam and his miserable failure, is utterly contradicted. The OGr. story is integrated with the other materials of the supplement: Jeroboam's wife's name is repeated from v.^{24e} as Ano, *i.e.*, Pharaoh's sister-in-law, following the utterly false attribution of the Edomite Hadad's history to Jeroboam; Jeroboam is housed at Serira (vv.^{24b.k}), but in \mathfrak{H} at Tirsah (v.¹⁷). As Kittel remarks, the mother's disguise is omitted, for she was not yet a queen. To the humble gifts she is to take to the prophet (v.³) OGr. adds 'and cakes for his children,' apparently a playful touch, while the list of gifts is repeated below in puerile fashion (vv.^{24h.1}). There remains the question of the literary relation of \mathfrak{H} and the supplement. The latter is shorter, but for the most part by the elision of the long denunciation (vv.⁷⁻¹⁶), which is stoutly Deuteronomic; but such omission was necessary in the setting of the midrash, for that condemnation damns Jeroboam for what he has done as king; and so the mourning for the child by 'all Israel' (v.¹³) had to be eliminated. The difference of opinion of critics as to the relation between \mathfrak{H} and the Gr. supplement has been discussed above. In regard to the present narrative even conservative critics, *e.g.*, Šanda, Skinner (p. 445 f.), regard the Greek as an earlier and simpler strain, which survived in Hebrew by some chance and fell into the hands of a Greek translator, while \mathfrak{H} is the result of subsequent Deuteronomic editing. The Greek appears indeed to have depended upon a Hebrew midrash, which however transformed the original to suit the entirely absurd setting in which it is placed. Only one phrase peculiar to the Greek has a note of originality, the plus in v.^{24m}, "[they will bewail the child,] Ah, lord" (see Note, v.¹³).

3. For the *cracknels/cakes/biscuits*, as the EVV render, see Note. 4. For the blind man's second sight *cf.* 21¹⁷ⁿ, II. 6³²ⁿ,

and see Volz, *Der Geist Gottes*, 36 ff. 5. Gunkel (*Einl. in die Psalmen*, 146, 160 ff.) lists similar 'royal oracles' in the O.T. and their parallels in non-Israelite sources. 14b. Cf. the variant English translations, and see Note. 16. Read: *because of the sin [D pl.] of Jeroboam that he has sinned, and in which he has involved Israel*; the latter phrase is juridical. 17. For Tirsah, incidentally mentioned as the royal residence, see Comm., 15³³. 18. Gunkel (*Einl.*, 160) lists the similar 'Leichenklagen' in the O.T.

VV.¹⁹⁻²⁰. The conclusion: Jeroboam's death, and the succession. *How he warred, and how he reigned*. We know through Egyptian sources of Shishak's invasion of Palestine, which involved North Israel; see below, vv.^{25ff.} V.³⁰ notes that "there was war between Rehoboam and Jeroboam continually," and 2 Ch. 13 details Jeroboam's disastrous defeat by Abijah of Judah.

VV.²¹⁻³¹. The reign of Rehoboam. || 2 Ch. 11⁵⁻¹²; cf. *Ant.*, viii, 10. 21. There appears for the first time the usual introductory formula giving the age of the king at accession, the length of his reign, and the queen-mother's name; see Int., §13, b. The age at accession is at first only occasionally given, and never for the Northern dynasty; the next case is that of Jehoshaphat (22⁴¹), then Jehoash (II. 12¹), after that regularly. Rehoboam's age of 40 years may point to the fact (or to the theory, if Solomon's regnal term of 40 years is an invention) that he was the first-born son after his father's accession, a status which had its claim in Oriental dynasties. His reign lasted 17 years. These datings are contradicted by 12^{24a} (not 12¹), where the figures 16 and 12 are given respectively. These figures (despite *BH*, 'fortasse recte') are doubtless artificial, invented perhaps to agree with the statement of Rehoboam's advising with "the youths who had grown up with him" (12⁸); cf. the invention of 12 years for Solomon's age at accession in Hex. texts, 2¹². The queen-mother's name is given, as regularly below; her formal title was 'Lady' (*gēbīrāh*), e.g., 15¹³. This datum fails for the North. The lady in question was *Naamah the Ammonitess*; the Gr. supplement makes of her a daughter of Hanun b. Nahash, a construction based upon 2 Sam 10². At v.^{31b} this item of the queen-mother is erroneously repeated, being absent in

OGrr. The intrusive phrase, [*Jerusalem*] *the city which YHWH chose out of all the tribes of Israel to set his name there*, is evidently interpolation from Ch. 12¹³.

VV.²²⁻²⁴ present a moralizing condemnation of the religious perversions of the reign. According to \mathfrak{H} *Judah did what was evil in the eyes of YHWH, and they provoked him*, etc. OGrr. replaced 'Judah' with 'Rehoboam'; cf. 2 Ch. 12¹⁴, and the reference below to Abijam's 'father's sins' (15³). The heathenish reaction after the reigns of David and Solomon (but *n.b.* 11^{1ff.}) is presented in the later customary language: the construction of *high-places* [*bāmôt*] and *pillars* [*maššēbôt*] and *Asherah-symbols* [EVV transliterate with *Asherim*] *upon every high hill and under every green tree*; cf. Dt. 12^{2ff.}, Jer. 2²⁰, 3⁶⁻¹³, Is. 57⁵, Eze. 6^{3ff.}, etc.; for the archæological light cast upon these institutions see the Archæologies of Nowack and Benzinger, Gressmann, *ATB* vol. 2 with extensive plates; Cook, *Religion of Anc. Palestine*; Barton, *AB* ch. 11; Burrows, *WMTS* §§130 ff.; Albright, *ARI* (see Index). *Sodomites* of EVV (see the story in Gen. 19) translates an adjective differing only vocally as *kādēš* from the word for 'holy,' *kādōš*. The group appears again in 15¹², 22⁴⁷, II. 23⁷; they are the 'dogs' whose hire may not be brought into YHWH's house (Dt. 23^{18f.}), which caste of 'dogs' appears among the Phœnician hierodules (*CIS* I, no. 8). In an interesting note of Jerome's, *Comm. ad Hoseam*, iii, 1261, cited by Movers, *Die Phönizier*, 683, and Keil, *ad loc.*, he remarks that the term means the Galli, religious self-castrated eunuchs of the Attis religion of his day (cf. Lucian, *De Dea Syra*, 15, etc.): but 'in other places,' he says 'Cadesim' is used of 'virī exsecti libidine,' *i.e.*, male prostitutes; he notes Aquila's rendering, ἐνηλλαγμένοι ('denatured,' cf. μετήλλαξαν, Rom. 1²⁸, of female perverts), and Symmachus's use of τετελεσμένοι, *i.e.*, 'initiates.' See Note further. For the subject at large see B. A. Brooks, 'Fertility Cult Functionaries in the O.T.,' *JBL* 60 (1941), 227 ff.

VV.²⁵⁻²⁸ briefly present Shishak's raid in Palestine, with particular note of his spoliation of the sacred and royal treasures. This note is of archival origin, with the editorial introduction, *and it came to pass* (see the writer's article, *JBL* 53 [1934], 48); the Pharaoh's name is given (as also in the

story of Jeroboam, 11⁴⁰), a specification that does not occur again until Hezekiah's reign (II. 19⁹). The regnal year is given, as before only in connexion with temple history (6¹). The date is the first of international reference in the Bible. The item refers to the palace-complex; it notes the looting of temple and palace, but is especially concerned with the disappearance of Solomon's golden shields (*cf.* 10^{16f.}). A similar archival note appears at 15¹⁸. For the processions of Assyrian kings see Meissner, *Bab. u. Ass.*, I, 67 f., and for a procession at coronation *cf.* II. 11^{9f.}. For the *guards*, literally *runners*, *cf.* II. 10²⁵, 11¹³.¹⁹, 1 Sam. 22¹⁷, etc.; they were technically the escort before the royal chariot (*cf.* 1⁵). The Pharaoh's name is variously given by 𐤊 , Kt. and Kr., as Shishak, Shushak (see Note further). Egyptologists still variously vocalize the Pharaoh's name, *e.g.*, Sheshenk (Petrie), Sheshonk (Breasted), Shoshenk (Müller, Meyer). The *fifth year* of the reign is chronologically dubious.¹ That monarch's famous inscription at Karnak records his extensive raid throughout Palestine; see for the translation Breasted, *ARE* 4, §§709 ff., and for its historical interpretation Müller, *Asien u. Europa*, 166 ff.; Alt, *Israel u. Aegypten*, 11-41; also for various expositions the historians Breasted, Kittel, Meyer, Olmstead, Robinson; *cf.* Petrie, *Palestine and Israel*. For the question concerning Solomon's father-in-law, whether Shishak or a predecessor, see *Comm.*, 3¹. From the inscription Shishak does not appear as an ally of Jeroboam, as the partial Judæan record suggested to past scholars (although Robinson, *HI* 275, still maintains this position, holding that Jeroboam, in his 'desperate straits' was rescued by 'his patron and overlord Sheshonk'), but rather as the enemy who took advantage of the now divided and weakened Hebrew state to raid and

¹ The Egyptian records give no dating for the Pharaoh's expedition into Palestine, and with the uncertain early chronology of the Davidic line agreement of scholars has not been attained for the Biblical date. Petrie dates the event from the Bible chronology and arrives at 933 B.C. (*Hist. of Egypt*, 3, 235); Breasted as about the year 926 (*Hist. of Egypt*, 529); Meyer about 930 (*GA* 2, 2, 46); Olmstead at 931 (*HPS* 354); Lewy and Albr. date the accession of Rehoboam about 922, and accordingly his fifth year would be about 917 (Albr., *BASOR* 87 [1942], 28). See Petrie at large (pp. 227 ff.) for the chronological problems connected with the 22d Dynasty.

despoil it, but with no permanent results. The list of some 150 'captured' cities (*cf.* especially Müller, Alt, Olmstead), each represented by a cartouche figuring a bound captive with a place-name attached, includes such Northern cities as Taanach, Megiddo, Shunem, Beth-shean, as well as many towns in the west and south of Judah. At Megiddo the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago has discovered a large but broken monument erected by Shishak; see C. S. Fisher, *Or. Institute Communications*, No. 4 (1929), figs. 7A, 7B, and Petrie reports a massive brick construction of the monarch at Beth-pelet (*Beth-Pelet*, I, 1930). It is generally recognized for the other cities which Shishak 'took,' that it was rather their tribute he received; so Jerusalem was not actually taken, but the king would have paid a sumptuous indemnity in specie and *objets d'art*, like the gold shields. For subsequent history of the reign 2 Ch. 11^{5ff.} has an authentic note concerning Rehoboam's fortification of fifteen 'cities of defence,' all to the south and west of Jerusalem, evidently after Shishak's raid. Glueck has come definitely to the conclusion that the destruction of Esyon-geber I by fire was caused by Shishak's invasion, thus greatly extending the map of that onslaught and confirming Ch.; see *BASOR* 75 (1939), 17 ff., and *The Other Side of the Jordan*, 105. V.³⁰ with the report that *there was war between Rehoboam and Jeroboam continually* [Heb. *all the days*] is presumably true history, if literally only a deduction from 15^{16ff.}; it manifestly contradicts the prophet-story in 12^{21ff.} **31.** *And his mother's name was Naamah the Ammonitess*: this inserted repetition of v.²¹ is absent in OGrr., §.

For the assumed Aquilanic character of the Hexaplaric text in this section (*e.g.*, in A §^H) see Burkitt's discussion in his *Fragments of the Book of Kings*, 33 f., and Reider, *Prolegomena to . . . Aquila*, 156 ff. (see Int., §4, c); Burkitt proves that the Hexaplaric text is not an extract from Aquila but is the LXX text of 12^{24g-h}, emended into general, but not complete concord with Aquila's translation. This judgment explains the plus of 'the cakes for his children,' v.³, and the appearance of Σαριρα in place of Aquilanic Θερασδε = תרצתה.—1. בעת ההיא: indefinite, 'at a time,' as in Aram. use of the pronoun.—2. והשתנית: Ginsb. records a variant, חי—, in agreement with foll. אני Kt.; for occurrence of these older forms see GK §32, h.—הנה: 12 MSS והנה=Grr.—לְקַלָּה: corrected

by St., *BH*, *al.*, to לָקַחְתָּ, forsooth on ground of the inf. in Gr.; but the parallel מַנְבִּירָה, 15¹³, supports הָ here; also *cf.* עָרַי אָבִיר, Num. 24²⁰.—3. עִשְׂרָה לֶחֶם: for the exceptional sing. see GK §134, f. — E^{12} adds κ. κολληματα τ. τεκνοῖς αὐτοῦ, which E^H inserts here, rdg. κολληματα; the latter word at 2 Sam. 13⁶ tr. לַבְבוֹת, 'poultices'; both Heb. and Gr. (*cf.* Sophocles, *Lex.*) used the respective words in both senses, 'cakes/poultices.'—נִקְרָאִים: in Josh. 9^{6, 12}=crumbled bread. Here E σταφυλήν, E^H σταφίδας='raisins'; ט כַּסְנִין = S , 'sweetmeats,' as in Talmud.—בִּקְבֵק דְּבֵשׁ: for such cruses in beehive shape see Badè, *Some Tombs at Tell en-Nasbeh* (1931), 27, pl. ix, and on כ' A. M. Honeyman, *PEQ* 1939, 79. The second noun may have been used of any sweet syrup, like the current Arab. *dibs*; Šanda cites Jos., *BJ* iv, 8, 3, on the excellent 'honey,' μέλι, made from dates of the Ghor. For such sweetmeats see Benz., *Arch.*, 68.—5. [בְּנֹה] אֵל: read על; the same change to be made with some MSS in v.¹⁰.—וְיָהּ כִּבְאָה וְהִיא מַתְנַכְרָה: St. regards as an insertion into the divine word; however the apparently ungrammatical וְיָהּ (E^H read as וְיָהּ, accepted by Burn., *BH*, *al.*) is conditional, *i.e.*, "though be it, when she enters she be disguised"; *cf.* GK §159, d, and the similar use of the jussive in Arabic, Wright, *Arab. Gr.*, 2, §13.—6. רַגְלֵיהָ בָאָה: the apparently non-syntactical phrase is generally corrected, *e.g.*, by *BH* to רַגְלֵי הַבָּאָה; but Haupt properly identifies the Heb. with the *hal* construction of the Arabic, where the ppl. is in the acc., referring to the suffixed pron.; see Wright, vol. 2, 113. Burn. also defends הָ, and *cf.* Ps. 69⁴, כָּלוּ עֵינַי מִיָּהּ; for similar cases see Ewald, *Lehrb.*, §317, c; and so E^H correctly translates.—וְלִמָּה זֶה: for this and similar combinations, as in Arab., Aram., see Burn.—הַקָּשָׁה אֵלַיךְ קָשָׁה = E^H ἀποστολος προς σε σκληρος (the only case of the noun in Gr. O.T.), *sc.* as קָשָׁה; but the fem. is adverbial acc. to the passive, the active meaning 'to send one with a hard message'; see Ewald, §284, c, Burn.—7. נִגִּיד: the antique word, as at 1³⁵.—10. [בֵּית] אֵל: = E^H εἰς; but read על with 7 MSS.—מִשְׁתַּן בְּקִיר: the whole phrase is repeated at 21²¹, II. 9⁸ (but rdg. וְיִצְוֶר), and *cf.* II. 14²⁶. Of Engl. VSS AV alone properly translates the initial obscene word, 'him that pisseth against the wall,' subsequent VSS euphemizing, 'every man-child.' The verbal form has been explained as a secondary root from שָׁן, 'to piss' (see *Lexx.*), but impossibly. Stade, on II. 14²⁶, has suggested the Hithp. with change of vocalization. But it is best explained as Iftéal, which mode of Akk. *šinu* appears (Bezold, *BAG s.v.*), while it also occurs in the Moabite Stone (אִלְתַּיִם), and now in the Ugaritic; see *RSMT* 22; Gordon, *Ugar. Handbook*, 1, §9, 29. For reviews of interpretations of the two pass. ppls. see Burn., Šanda, Driver on the occurrence of the phrase at Dt. 32³⁶, and now J. Lewy, *HUCA* 12-13 (1937-38), 99 ff. Lewy cites seven various interpretations, all revolving about the theme of 'bond and free,' and adds a fresh solution, 'unborn (shut up in the womb) and born' (*cf.* Akk. *izbu*,

'new-born child'). But why should the unborn child be a concern here? Eissf. notes another view expressed by P. Saydon at the Brussels Congress of Orientalists, 1938 (*Theol. Blätter*, 1938, 303), translating with 'gehemmt u. hilflos.' The writer may suggest that after the initial obscene phrase the pass. ppls. mean 'in private and unrestrained,' *i.e.*, distinguishing between the gentleman and the boor in the street.—אחר־י: not the prep., but = 'the last of'; שארית, אחרית are used similarly.—יבער: impers. sing.; change to the pass., as *BH* suggests, is unnecessary; for the root, generally distinguished semantically into two, see Gray, *Isaiah*, xxi, *seq.*—12. בבאה; read רגביא.—רגלך: 1 MS רגלך, and so the Gr. as sing.—13. וספרו וספראל ל: לו כל ישראל 12^{24m}, κ. το παιδαριον κοφονται σται κυριε, *i.e.*, the mourning cry, ההי ארון as at Jer. 22¹⁸, 34⁵, appropriate to a prince (otherwise 13³⁰, 'Ah, my brother!'); the phrase may well be original and have been euphemistically omitted by 𐤇; the Gr. camouflaged the possibly heathenish expression ('*adōn* = 'Adonis'), with an added gloss, στι ευρεθη εν αυτω ρημα καλον περι τ. κυριου; see W. W. Baudissin, *Adonis u. Esmun* (1911), 91; C. W. North, *ZAW* 1932, 31 f.—"דבר טוב אל: St. thinks that אל is 'beyond explanation'; a similar phrase, Est. 5⁴, but with prep. על, which Haupt would read here, comparing Akk. *ḫiba elī*; but 𐤇 may stand.—14. זה היום ומה גם עתה: and so exactly the Gr.; acc. to St. the phrase is 'unintelligible'; EVV "that day, but what? even now"; JV "that day. But what is it even then?"; Kit., "an jenem Tag. Aber dann noch (v.¹⁵) wird J. Israel schlagen" (rdg. יכה as וכה), and so Moff., Chic. B., and with cautious approval Sk. 𐤇 attempts an elucidation: "he who exists to-day, and he who will be born to-morrow." Joüon (*Mél.*, 5, 475) proposes to read זה for מה, *cf.* 𐤅 'in hoc tempore'; Klost. absurdly finds in it original "and this was Abijah b. Maacah," *cf.* 2 Ch. 13^{17a}. Interpretation may be ventured as follows: זה היום = 'the matter of the day,' *i.e.*, 'as regards to-day' (for this use of the demonstrative relative see the writer's Note in *JBL* 43 [1924], 227), 'and what also is now,' *i.e.*, 'to-day and at once.'—15. באשר יגור הקנה: Kit., *BH* find a lacuna preceding, and write in והתגוררו, following the example of Graetz, who replaced the preceding והכה with והגיר; but the diction can be explained, with St., as elliptical, or rather as mixture of metaphors.—16. ויתן: an irregular, late consecution; for *mng.* of the verb, 'to give up,' *cf.* Mic. 5².—הנאות: many MSS הנאת; the sing. is to be adopted, as at 15³⁴; the pl. was an easy amplification.—20. גרב: *cf.* now the name on a seal, גרבאל (*IAE*, 189), and גרביהו in a Lachish letter (Torczyner, no. iii); the verbal element is also Thamudene (*NPS* 1, 136).

21. 'Judah': 𐤇^L + 'Benjamin.'—נעמה: Β† Μαχαμ, *cf.* מטעה, name of Abijah's wife, 15¹⁰; otherwise Gr. here and at 12^{24a} support 𐤇.—22. יהורה: OGr., 'Rehoboam,' with consequent change of the following verbs (but not in v.²³) into singulars, yet stopping at the change of 'their fathers' into 'his fathers,' which

would have involved condemnation of the royal paragon David (cf. 15³, etc.); yet St. makes this further change as well, regarding Rehoboam as the implied subject throughout.—23. הנה הנח: OGrr. om., and so St.; but the phrase accentuates the part the new generation played.—24. שָׁרָה: the inarticulate sing. collective is noticeable; at 22⁴⁷ שָׁרָה, at 15¹² the pl.; the sing. is derogatory, aligning the subject with brute species, e.g., בָּקָר, הָעֵץ; cf. Ew., *Lehrb.*, §176, b. Šanda properly thinks of the inclusion of both sexes. Grr., σύνδεσμος, which has suggested to some critics original שָׁרָה, 'conspiracy,' as at II. 11⁴⁴; but συνδ.=συμπλοκή, 16^{28d}, and the two words are synonymous, used of sexual copulation; see Sophocles, *Lex.*, s.vv. συνδ., συμπλεκτικός, for their secular mngs. Sym. has here τελετή. and similarly the Grr., including the Three, at 15¹², τὰς τελετάς (this noun not in Sophocles='rites'?): see Note, *ibid.*, and also Note to 22⁴⁷ for the Grr. there.—25. קָשָׁה Kt., קָשָׁה Kt.=Kt. 11⁴⁰, and so Ch., and ט ש א ב here. Grr. Σουσακειμ in both places; *Ant.*, vii, 5, 3; viii, 10, 2, vulgar text Σουσακος, but Niese Ισωκος in the latter ref. (see Rahlfs, SS 3, 97, for tradition of the name in Jos.); Manetho, Σεσωγκις; in an Akk. text of Ashurbanipal's (*KB* 2, 162) appears a *n. pr.* Susinḫu. H. Gauthier, *Les rois d'Égypte*, vol. 3 (1914), cites Σεσωγχωσις, 'Senecosis.' Rahlfs explains the Gr. termination -ειμ as dittog. of foll. *m(lk)*.—26. אֶצִּיב: OGrr. pref. 'all.'—הַכֵּל לְקָרָה: the phrase may be preserved by omitting the conj.; or is it an *et cetera*, preceding the following detail?—To 'all the shields of gold' Grr. pref. "the golden spears which David took from the hand of the servants of Adraazar king of Soba, and brought to Jerusalem," taken from 2 Sam. 8⁷, where in reverse Grr. have added cross-reference to Shishak's despoliation here; but according to II. 11¹⁰ these Davidic donations were in the temple at a much later date. The Gr. texts have become confused by the intrusion; e.g., B N lost the words "which S. made," and several MSS=℄ have the plus, "and brought them into Egypt."—27. תָּרַחַם: in 20²⁴ תָּרַחַם; see Orlinsky's study, 'The Bibl. Prepositions *taḥat*,' etc., *HUCA* 17 (1943), 267 ff. The pl. appears to have arisen to express the idea of extension, for which cf. *pānim*, etc.—רָחַם: the pf. with Waw-consec. can be understood as iterative, "and he would commit (them)"; St. would correct to abs. inf., for which cf. GK §113, z. Grr. translated as though a pass. pl.—הַלֵּל [בַּיָּת]: ℄ ℄ 'the Lord.'—31. עַם אֲמֵינִי 2⁰: om., with ℄ and Ch.; the same repetition at 15²⁴.—אֲמֵינִי: 10 MSS Ken., deR., Ch., אֲמֵינִי; Grr., Αβιον, Αβια. אֲמֵינִי occurs on a Samaritan ostracon and on a seal (*IAE* 221). For the form see Noth, *IP* 234, who *cf.* the Tell Ta'annak *Aḥiyami*, deciding correctly that it is a hypocoristic in -ām; cf. אֲמֵינִי, אֲמֵינִי. The element is common in S. Arab. *nu. pr.*, see D. H. Müller, *ZDMG* 32, 543 ff. G. R. Driver has suggested (*ZAW* 46 [1928], 12, n. 6) that the form is derogatory; but rather it was popular; cf. Scottish 'King Jamie,' 'Prince Charlie.'

15¹⁻⁸. The reign of Abijam of Judah. || 2 Ch. 13; *cf. Ant.*, viii, 11, 2, 3. **1.** Abijam's accession is dated, perhaps loosely, *in the eighteenth year of Jeroboam*, on the count of Rehoboam's seventeen years (14²¹) as full years. **2.** His mother's name is given as *Maacah bath Abishalom*; for the problems concerning the lady's name see below on v.¹⁰. Jos. (*Ant.*, viii, 10, 1) ingeniously discovers in her a daughter of Absalom's daughter Tamar (*cf. 2 Sam.* 13^{1ff.}). Such late traditions (*cf. Ch.*) are probably worthless. VV.^{4. 5a} are an evident Deuteronomic intrusion; for the *lamp cf. 11³⁶*. **5.** *except in the case of Uriah the Hittite*: a unique moralizing judgment, and a late addition, absent in **Ⓢ Ⓢ**. **6.** *And there was war between Rehoboam and Jeroboam*, etc., lacking in OGrr., is a senseless repetition of 14³⁰. **7b.** *And there was war between Abijam and Jeroboam*: this is out of place after v.³, is secondary, induced by Ch.'s long story of the conflict between the two kings.

VV.⁹⁻²⁴. The reign of Asa of Judah. || 2 Ch. 14-16; *cf. Ant.*, viii, 12.

VV.⁹⁻¹⁵. His reform of the religious abuses introduced by the queen-dowager. **9.** *In the twentieth year of Jeroboam*: the 3-year reign of Abijam is correctly treated as only two full years. **10.** The mother's name is the same as that of the grandmother, v.². Wellhausen has accordingly suggested (*Prolegomena*, 216) that Asa was Abijam's brother, entailing correction of 'his son' (v.⁸) to 'his brother.' Ch. actually gives the king two mothers, Maacah bath Absalom (11²⁰), and Micaiah (Grr., Maacah) bath Uriel of Gibeah (13²). These variations appear as attempts to dispose of the identity of name for the two queens. We may best suppose that the subsequent reference to *Maacah his mother . . . the Lady* (v.¹³) has introduced a change from the original name of the mother (so Kittel, Burney), or that there was no tradition of the queen's name because of the grandmother's domination. The title *Lady* (*gēbīrāh*—EVV *queen*) is that of the queen-mother, as at II. 10¹³. VV.¹²⁻¹⁵ report the reforms, of which the prime step was the removal of the dowager. For the influence of this personage in the ancient Orient there are, in addition to Jezebel (16³¹, etc.) and Athaliah (II. 11), the cases of Sammuramat (Semiramis), who ruled for five years during the

minority of her son Adad-nirari III (*ARA* 1, §§730 ff.; Olmstead, *HA* ch. 13) and Sennacherib's wife (see Comm., II. 18¹⁴). For Egypt Hatshepsut's power in the Thutmosid dynasty is a most striking case (Breasted, *HE* ch. 15). **12.** Of the several abominations purged by Asa the *sodomites* have appeared above (14²⁴); the *idols* of EVV represents a contemptuous word, *gillûl*, vocalized after the formation *šikkûš*, 'something to be abhorred,' as the root is used of abhorrence of things ritually tabooed, e.g., Lev. 11¹¹, etc. (Cf. the pronunciation 'Molek' for 'Melek'). **13.** The word translated 'abominable image' and later 'image' by EVV (exc. AV with 'idol'), 'obscene image' by Chic. B., implies something 'shocking.' The following vocable translated by EVV 'for an Asherah' means *to Asherah*, which is supported by the following reference to *her abominable image*. On this goddess, whose name came to be used of her conventional image, cf. 18¹⁹, II. 23⁴⁻⁶. The goddess plays a large part as divine mother in the Ugaritic mythology; see D. Nielsen, *Ras Šamra Mythologie u. biblische Mythologie*, and his subsequent study at large, 'Die altsem. Muttergöttin,' *ZDMG* 92 (1938), 594 ff. This image, possibly of wood, was subsequently burned at the Josianic reformation in the Kidron Wady, where the city dump was (II. 23⁶). **15.** The reference to *his father's and his own dedications*, which *he brought into YHWH's house*, is obscure. Šanda pertinently remarks that we may have here a summary of some ample temple document; the father may have patronized other sanctuaries, the son now collected all such dedications in the one legitimate temple.

VV. 16-22. The war with Baasha of Israel and the league with Damascus. **16. 17.** The energetic Baasha of the North, who seized the throne in Asa's third year, found himself free to take vigorous measures against Judah. His natural aim was to recover the march-land of Benjamin, which belonged historically and economically to the North, and by control of the open country north of Jerusalem to hem in its commercial and military avenues—that *he might allow none to go out or come in*. (*Vice versa*, according to 2 Ch. 13¹⁹ Abijam had taken three cities, including Bethel, in an aggressive campaign against Jeroboam.) Baasha proceeded to *build Ramah* as a controlling fortress on his southern boundary.

21. Upon Asa's coalition with Damascus Baasha *left off building Ramah, and returned to Tirsah* [so to read with Grr.: *He dwelt at Tirsah*]; for this place, evidently his capital, see Comm., v.³³. 22. Asa proceeded to dismantle Ramah; he made a levy of *all Judah, with none exempt*, and using the *stones and timbers of Ramah, he built Gibeah* [*Geba*] of Benjamin and Mispah. These three sites have been much *sub judice* for their identification. Albright has now satisfactorily identified Gibeah with Tell el-Fül, a hill 5 km. N of Jerusalem, possessing 'a remarkably fine view in all directions'; and he finds proof of Asa's hasty construction of his new fortress; see his 'Excavations and Results at Tell el-Fül (Gibeah of Saul),' *AASOR* 4 (1924), and Abel, *GP* 2, 334. The place remained the northern boundary of Judah until Josiah's reign (II. 23). Mispah (*mišpāh*, 'watch-tower') had long been identified with Tell en-Našbeh, 13 km. N of Jerusalem on the Nablus road, as is Tell el-Fül. Excavations undertaken there by W. F. Badè have corroborated that identification. It was a strongly fortified place, to use the excavator's words, "with the thickest and strongest city wall which has as yet been unearthed in Palestine," and he would assign it to Asa's age. The identification has appeared to have support from jar-handles stamped with *mšp*, as read by Badè, but the reading is most uncertain; of special interest is the discovery of the seal of Gedaliah, who centuries later acted as governor at Mispah; see Comm., II. 25^{22ff.}. See Badè's reports, *Palestine Institute Publications* (1926 and later, Berkeley, Calif.), and for his last statement, *ZAW*, Beih. 66 (1936), 30 ff. A brief survey of these operations is given by Olmstead, *HPS* 357 f. A full discussion of attempted identification is presented by Albright in *AASOR* 4, Appendix I, pp. 90 ff., making identification with Neby-Samwil (this retracted in *AJA* 1936, 158 f.). The identification with Tell en-Našbeh is accepted by Abel, *GP* 2, 388 ff.; Galling, *BR* 386. Ramah is generally identified with er-Rām 4 miles to the N of Jerusalem.¹ 18-20. Asa purchased the favour of an ally with *all the silver and the gold that were left in the treasuries of the house of YHWH and 'in'*

¹ Albright offers a very useful map for distinction of the localities N of Jerusalem in the same *Annual*, p. 75. For the history of this frontier see Smith's instructive chapter in his *HG*, ch. 12.

[with Heb. MSS] *the treasuries of the king's house*. The limitation on the treasures harks back to 14²⁶. The coalition with Damascus is of interest as presenting the earliest datum upon the vigour of the young Aramæan dynasty of that ancient city.² A certain Reson b. Eliada, a fugitive from the kingdom of Sobah, had established himself in Damascus, and was 'an adversary to Israel all the days of Solomon' (11^{23ff.}). His reign or dynasty must have been ephemeral. Asa's ally was *Ben-Hadad ben Tab-Rimmon ben Hezion, king of Aram, who had his seat in Damascus*. The state bears the name of the controlling folk; it later became more specifically Aram of Damascus. Ben-Hadad, the first of the name, is the same as the king who appears subsequently in the conflicts of Damascus with the Omrid dynasty, surviving at least until 853 B.C., for which date he is recorded in Shalmaneser's monolith inscription. There is now to be added the very interesting contribution rendered by Albright in presenting (*BASOR* 87 [1942], 23 ff.) along with extensive historical survey, a study of an Aramaic inscription recently published by Dunand in the *Bulletin du Musée de Beyrouth*, 3, 65 ff. The inscription records the erection of a stele to his lord Melkart by 'Bar-Hadad b. Tab-Ramman b. Hazyan,' *i.e.*, the monarch in question, and his genealogy is identical with the Biblical datum. For the *nn. pr.*, their mngs. and traditional variations see Notes. Yet another king of the same name, Ben (Bar)-Hadad ben Hazael appears below in 20¹, *cf.* 19¹⁵. Albright argues, following Meyer, justifiably for only two monarchs of the name, *vs.* the opinion that there were three such. See further Comm. on 20³⁴. V.¹⁹ is phrased *staccato*: *A league between me and thee, and [plus with MSS VSS, in sense=' as there was '] between my father and thy father! See, I have sent thee a gift of silver and gold; go, break thy league with Baasha*, etc. Judah had not hitherto been in preferred position. 20. The districts which Ben-Hadad *smote, i.e.*, harried, are listed in N-S direction. The name Iyon (EVV Ijon) survives in the present Merj-'Aiyūn (Spring-Meadow),

² For the early Syrian history see the particular monographs of E. G. H. Kraeling, *Aram and Israel*, A. Alt, 'Aram,' in *RVg*, and 'Die syrische Staatenwelt vor dem Einbruch der Assyrer,' *ZDMG* 1934, 233 ff., and for the chronology Albright, *BASOR* 87 (1942), 23 ff.

the lower part of the noble valley between the Lebanons; ³ for the geography of the whole region see Robinson, *LBR* 361 ff.; Albright, 'The Jordan Valley in the Bronze Age,' *AASOR* 6 (1926), 13 ff.; Dussaud, *TH* 22 ff.; Abel, *GP* 1, 12 ff.; and for identification of this site *ib.*, 2, 352. Dan, the ancient northern limit of Israel (*cf.* 12^{29f.}) is the modern Tell el-Ḳāḏi ('Hill of the Judge'), 5 km. from Banias. Abel-beth-Maachah was location of the House of Maachah, a tribe allied with the Aramæans against David (2 Sam. 10^{6ff.}), and has been identified with Abil el-Ḳamḥ, W of Dan (see GB, Šanda; Abel, *GP* 2, 233); the name appears as Abilakka in Tiglath-pileser's annals in connexion with the campaign in which he deposed Pekah king of Israel (Rogers, *CP* 320).⁴ Kinneroth, an artificial plural form, denotes the region about Kinnereth, lying by the Lake of Galilee, and giving the latter its name (Num. 34¹¹, etc.), which name was later replaced with Gennesaret; for the place and history of the name see Abel, *GP* 1, 494 ff., also Albright, *AASOR* 6 (1926), 25 ff. The raids covered *all the land of Naphtali*. They constitute the first chapter in the long history of Aram's superiority over Israel.

VV.^{23. 24}. The conclusion of the reign. **23**. The formal phrase, *all his might and all that he did*, is paralleled in the inscription of Eshmunazar king of the Sidonians, "according to the great things that I did" (line 9). The reference to *the cities that he built*, absent in OGrr., is an intrusion from 2 Ch. 14^{6f.}. The statement that *in his growing old he became diseased in his feet*, may well be archival; *cf.* the self-pity expressed by the Sidonian king in the same inscription, lines 12 f. The disease is easily diagnosed as a dropsy; see W. Epstein, *Die Medizin im A.T.* (1901), 148. The introductory particle *only* (EVV *nevertheless/but*) notes the disparity of this fate with the king's godliness (v.¹¹). Ch. moralizes: "In his disease he sought not to YHWH but to

³ The place appears in the list of Thutmose I's Syrian conquests (Breasted, *ARE* 2, 31 ff.). In *BASOR* 89 (1943) Albr. presents a fresh version of the Amarna tablet which names Iyon, as Ayyānu (p. 14). He derives the name from Heb. 'ai, 'ruin.'

⁴ The place appears as Abel-mayim in the duplicate account in 2 Ch. 16⁴, cited by Glueck along with other similar changes of place-names (*BASOR* 91 [1943], 16). He notes, *ib.*, Albright's interpretation of *abel* as not 'meadow,' but 'brook.'

the physicians," in this unlike the other pious king Hezekiah (II. 20). Lucian went further by prefixing to the statement of the disease the bald invention that "he did evil (before the Lord)." 24. The repeated *with his fathers* is to be elided (cf. 14³¹), as also, with OGrr., the epithet for David as *his father*; the burial was *in David's City*, the Ophel.

VV.²⁵⁻³². The reign of Nadab of Israel, his overthrow by the rebel Baasha, and the foredoomed end of the short-lived dynasty. Cf. *Ant.*, viii, 11, 4. With equation of the accession *in Asa's second year* and the reign of *two years* (v.²⁵) with its termination *in Asa's third year* (v.²⁸), the reign would have lasted one year and a fraction. The new king had vigour enough to lay siege to a Philistine stronghold in the old Danite territory, Gibbethon, named in the list of such cities, Josh. 19⁴¹⁻⁴⁶, but which remains not certainly identified (see Döllner, *GES* 215; Abel, *GP* 2, 333); it continued to be a military objective of Israel (16^{15ff.}). Baasha was doubtless leader of a military revolt like that of Jehu (II. 9). The resultant destruction of Jeroboam's whole family (vv.^{29f.}), adjudged as fulfilment of Ahijah's prophecy (14¹⁰), was the usual fate of a fallen dynasty. 30. *for the sin* [the sins] *of Jeroboam* [which he sinned and—OGrr. om.] *wherein he involved Israel, for the provocation whereby he provoked YHWH, the God of Israel*: for the first indictment, usual as against the Northern kings, cf. 14¹⁶, etc.; the bracketed reference to his personal sin is unnecessary, that is condemned in the following indictment, with which cf. 21²². 32. The v., absent in OGrr., is a secondary repetition of v.¹⁶.

Ch. 15. 1. וּבְשֵׁנָה: the conj (absent in Ch., 6¹) is unusual in this formula, appearing elsewhere only at v.⁹, II. 8¹⁶, 9²⁹.—2. שֵׁשׁ: OGrr., 'six,' by common confusion with שֵׁשׁ; the erroneous computation is maintained by OGrr. in v.⁹, as also in the plus in v.⁸.—בִּירוּשָׁלַם: 6 (B v) 6 om.; similar omission in OGrr., v.⁴, forsooth as limitation of the kingdom.—3. כָּל: OGrr. om.—הַבְּאוֹת: many MSS read the sing. with v.²⁶, etc.; cf. 14¹⁶; the preceding כָּל is then secondary.—דָּוִד: B u om.; David was not his father!—4. אֵלָהֵי: OGrr. om., as too restrictive.—בְּנֵי: now generally corrected to בְּנֵי with Grr.; but the sing. is reminiscent of 11³⁶, and is to be retained (so Šanda).—6. 'Rehoboam': to avoid the absurdity Grr. N *al.* have Αβα.—8. אֲבֹתָיו: OGrr. plus 'in the 24th year of Jeroboam,' from v.⁹.—אֲסָא: for the hypocoristic א—see Noth, *IP* 40; the root may be 'ws, 'to give,' common in

OArab. names; see *NPS* 1, 41 f.—9. מלך יהודה: many MSS ' על מ' = Grr.; both uses occur; see Bär, and St.'s full note on the formula.—12. הקרשים: ⚡ ⚡^H τας τελετας, to which ⚡^H has a gloss, 'shameful rites'; see Field. ⚡^L τ. σθηλας, for which Rahlfs (*SS* 3, 202 f.) *cf.* 14²³; but it is corruption of obscure τελετας.—גללים: Grr., επιτηδεύματα, 'practices.' The semantic development is uncertain; gal, 'stone-heap,' gālāl, 'dung,' have been compared; see Baudissin, *ZDMG* 58, 395 ff.—13. מנבירה: for the construction *cf.* מלך, 14².—מלצת: = Ch.; the verb = 'to shake' at Job 9⁶: Grr., συνοδον = ⚡^H (*cf.* ⚡ עירא), *i.e.*, 'concourse'—by what etymology? The Grr. connect with the following by translating לאינה with 'in her (the queen's) grove,' with thought of the vegetation rites.—ויכרת: Perles remarks that rather the verb כרת is expected, as in similar contexts, *e.g.*, Dt. 9²¹ (*JQR* 2 [1911], 115).—מפלצתה: Grr., τ. καταδυνσεις αυτης, 'her descents'; ⚡ 'caverns' = ⚡^H, prob. with reminiscence of Is. 65⁴; also variant καταλυσεις, 'lodgings.' ⚡ is most expansive, with two interpretations of the word, rendering with "ne esset princeps in sacris Priapi, et in luco ('grove') eius, quem consecravit, subvertitque specum ('cave') eius, et confregit simulacrum turpissimum."—קרדון ⚡ των κεδρων, ⚡^L Κεδρων.—14. סרו = Ch.; Grr. as though הסירו; similar variation at 22⁴⁴, etc.; ⚡ is to be retained, the intransitive avoiding direct blame of the king; see St.'s lengthy note.—15. וקדשו, Kt., וקדש קר: read with Kt. וקדש, and so Ch., VSS. For the repeated noun Grr. have κιονας, 'pillars'; Šanda suggests tr. as of קרש for which Grr., Ex. 26¹⁵, have στῦλος. 16. The v. is protasis to v.¹⁷: "And there being war," etc.—בעש: so Ginsb., *BH*, as also in Ch.; Bär בעשא (=JV) throughout; see those editors *ad loc.*, and for extra-Biblical cases GB. The first element was בעל, *cf.* בענה, 4¹², the second has been reduced to a caritative, *cf.* אבא.—18. באוצרות בית: Grr., ⚡ א om. out of reverence; introduced by ⚡^H from Aq.—ואת אוצרות: over 20 MSS and Targumic texts (see deR.), 'ובא' = ⚡ ⚡, to be preferred; Ch. has another variant.—מלך: 6 MSS המלך, and so Kr.; the combination בית מלך appears at II. 11²⁰, 15²⁵, again corrected by Kr.; but the antique grammar is supported by בת מלך in the Mesha inscr., line 23.—בן הדר: the name appears throughout in the Grr. as 'son of Ader,' supported by 3 Heb. MSS, בן הדר, and Shalmaneser's opponent was for long so read, Bir-Idri (*e.g.*, Rogers, *CP* 297), so supporting the Gr. variant. But the first element in the Akk. transcription is now preferably understood as ideogram for the god Adad/Hadad, resulting in Adad-idri, identical then with the name Hadadezer, that of the king of Sobah (11²³). See Deimel, *Pantheon babylonicum*, 45; Meyer, *GA* 2, 2, 332.⁵ The

⁵ As *vs.* the Biblical Gr. it is to be noted that Josephus in the subsequent mention of the name corroborates ⚡ with the rendering "Αδαδος, *e.g.*, *Ant.*, viii, 14, *passim*. The Gr. name βαραδάδης has been found at Dura-Europos; see Baur and Rostovtzeff, *Excavations*, 46 f.

Heb. form is now corroborated by its Aramaic equivalent in the Zakar inscription, naming Bar-Hadad (the second), king of Damascus.—גִּרְמֹן: the second element, playfully vocalized *rimmôn*, i.e., 'pomegranate,' is properly *rammân*, a constant Akk. epithet of Addu-Hadad, and with this name as Rimmon that deity appears at II. 5¹⁸.—חַיִּין: the name, despite suggested corrections (e.g., by Dhorme to the 'Rezon' of 11²³, *RB* 7 [1910], 71), is finally vouched for by Albr.'s art., cited above. His n. 7 is a discussion of the name.—19. וַיַּעַל: the jussive וַיַּעַל is expected; see Orlinsky, *JQR* 32 (1941), 200 f.—26. חַמָּאוֹת: read again the sing., here and below, v.³⁰.—27. לְבֵית יִשְׁשַׁכָּר: 'of the house of Issachar'; the phrase is unique. The Gr. texts are woefully confused in this v.; cf. Klost., Rahlfs, *SS* 3, 203, for attempted restorations.—28. The 'third' year is changed to the 'fourth,' and below, v.³³, 'third' to the 'fifth,' by Gr. MSS *b i c*₂; acc. to Rahlfs (*ib.*, 67) this is a revision after Eusebius's system.—חַמָּוֹת: Ⓞ om. because of indefiniteness of antecedent; Ⓞ^L supplied with 'Baasha over Israel.'—29. בְּמַלְכוֹ: for כ in this temporal sense see GB 327; MSS בְּמַלְכוֹ.—כֹּל: 2 MSS, Ⓞ om. as superfluous—a matter of literary taste, *vs.* St.—30. [אִשְׂרָאֵל] הָאֵל וְאִשְׂרָאֵל: OGrr. om.; see Comm.—בְּנֵעָוָה: =Ⓞ^L; *al.* Grr. prefix 'and' (and so *BH*), an improvement indeed. St. takes v.^{30b} as a marginal gloss, Klost. would elide אִשְׂרָאֵל הַנֵּעִים, but such criticism is unbased.

15³³-16⁷. The reign of Baasha of Israel. Cf. *Ant.*, viii, 12, 3, 4. 33. *In the third year of Asa king of Judah Baasha ben Ahijah became king over all Israel in Tirsah [sc. and was king] twenty-four years.* Tirsah as the royal residence has already appeared indirectly above, 14¹⁷, 15²¹. It remained the capital until Omri's reign (16^{23f.}), and appears later in the history (II. 15^{14. 16}). It was once a royal Canaanite city (Jos. 12²¹), and was famous for its beauty like Jerusalem (Cant. 6⁴). For its identification see BDD *s.v.*, Döllner, *GES* 214 f., and Albrigh's extensive study, 'The Site of Tirzah,' *JPOS* 1931, 241 ff.; he rejects certain proposed identifications on philological and critical grounds, and finds the site at Tell el-Fār'ah, 11 km. NE of Nablus; for criticism of this view see Alt, *Pjb.*, 1932, 40 ff., and also Abel, *GP* 2, 485, who leaves the place unidentified. Ch. 16. 1. The only additional item to Baasha's history given here is a prophetic denunciation. The prophet Jehu ben Hanani appears also in the Chronicler's narrative of Jehoshaphat's reign (II. 19^{2f.}, 20^{3f.}). The oracle depends for its elements upon that of Ahijah to Jeroboam's

wife (14^{7ff.}). 7. The v. appears to be a useless repetition of what precedes, is possibly a variant form from another source.

And moreover through Jehu ben Hanani [om. the prophet—see Note] the word of YHWH came to Baasha and to his house [H+ and] because of all the evil that he did in YHWH's eyes in provoking him by the work of his hands, in becoming like the house of Jeroboam, and because he smote it [EVV him]. No unimportant passage has provoked more dispute than the last sentence. D renders with "ob hanc causam occidit eum." Poole gives a half column to the varieties of interpretation, discussing whether the object is Jeroboam *in loco* Nadab, or Nadab, or the house. Klostermann would find here trace of an oracle of Jehu's commissioning Baasha to destroy Jeroboam's house, with ample rewriting of the text. Šanda omits the sentence, and finds in the v. an oracle by an unnamed prophet, so eliding Jehu's name. The sentence is generally recognized as a moralizing explanation of the doom upon Baasha for his own actual sin in exterminating Jeroboam's family, after the manner of Hoshea's condemnation of Jehu's bloody massacre of the Omrids (Hos. 1⁴). But such fine ethical moralizing does not appear in these late pious additions. The simplest solution would lie in the understanding of the conjunctive phrase 'because that' as 'despite that,' which is possible in the Heb. particle involved (see Note). See Poole and Keil for theologizing at length over the human sin that is involved in such cases of theodicy.

16⁸⁻¹⁴. The reign of Elah of Israel. Cf. *Ant.*, viii, 12, 4. 8. *The twenty-sixth year of Asa* appears in G , v. 6, as 'the 20th' (see Note, v. 15), in Hex. as 'the 29th,' which is a learned correction. The *two years* of Elah's reign were completed according to v. 10 in Asa's 27th year, *i.e.*, it terminated within the second year; for similar calculation cf. Nadab's reign, 15^{25ff.} The dating for the end of the reign in v. 10 is in unusual place; it is missing in OGrr., and has been introduced from v. 15. Cf. Begrich, *Chronologie*, 181. 9. 10. The regicide Zimri (a nobody, as his father is not named) took advantage of the absence of the army at Gibbethon, having the co-operation of his *half-squadron of the chariotry*. In an otherwise dry historical passage the tradition of Elah's drunken bout is of

interest. **11-13.** The originality of much of this material is disputed. V.^{12a}, and *Zimri destroyed all the house of Baasha*, missing in OGrr., repeats v.¹¹. Also OGrr. omit in v.¹¹ *he did not leave him a male (=14¹⁰) and his nearest of kin and friends*; the uniqueness of the final clause may guarantee the originality of the passage, which is to be kept, with Stade. V.¹³ is verbose, is briefer in OGrr.; otherwise it is always Jeroboam's sin that brought guilt upon Israel, and there is no background for the indictment of this brief dynasty as renegades, coupling them with *the vanities* (idolatrous practices) of Israel; Stade suggests a rewriting of the passage.

VV.¹⁵⁻²². Turmoil in the North; the reign of Zimri for a week, civil war between Omri and Tibni for some three years, with the success and accession of the former. Cf. *Ant.*, viii, 12, 4, 5. Following the futile attempts of Jeroboam and Baasha to found dynasties, three ambitious commanders strove to seize the throne. Zimri, *captain of the half-squadron of the chariotry* (v.⁹), had been able by a coup to get rid of the sot Elah in his palace. **15. 16.** The army, which was besieging Gibbethon, in resumption of the earlier bootless operation (15²⁷), hearing the news, *made Omri, the army-commander, king over Israel* (the real subject being designated as 'all Israel'). **17. 18.** Omri proceeded rapidly, within seven days, to Tirsah, where Zimri the would-be king fled *into the castle* (some technical architectural term) *of the royal palace*, which he burned down over his own head. **21. 22.** These few explicit details are followed with a brief statement of civil war: *half of the people* following a certain Tibni ben Ginath and the other *half*, Omri; the struggle lasted for three to four years (cf. vv.^{15. 23}), terminating with Tibni's death, whereupon *Omri became king*. It is of interest to observe that while the army hailed Omri as king, the dating of his legal accession is four years later; we have to suppose a formal, popular affirmation at that time, as in the case of the assembly at Shechem (ch. 12). A further detail with respect to Tibni is preserved by the Grr., which add to the statement in v.²² that *Tibni died* the plus, "and Joram his brother at that time." This appears like an original, if abbreviated, memorandum; it is generally accepted by commentators and historians, e.g., Thenius, Kamphausen, Benzinger, Kittel, Skinner, Olmstead, Robinson; Stade disputes

this position. The amount of striking detail in this confused history is remarkable; the account of Zimri's conspiracy is definitely docketed as from the Annals (v.²⁰).

For the chronology of this period of civil war v.¹⁵ dates the rise of the conflict between Omri and Tibni in Asa's 27th year (the Grr. varying here), and v.²³ assigns Omri's accession to the 31st year; the interval of 4 years must then have been officially accredited to Tibni, and so the Grr. add at end of v.²², "(Omri reigned) after Tibni." This interval is generally accepted by chronologers. Also \mathfrak{G} , followed by \mathfrak{G}^L , introduces after v.²⁸ the section on Jehoshaphat's reign, 22⁴¹⁻⁵¹, \mathfrak{G} again repeating it in place as in \mathfrak{H} . \mathfrak{G} in this intruded passage dates Jehoshaphat's accession in Omri's 11th year, instead of Ahab's 4th year. The difference of 6/7 years may be accounted for by assuming that the '6 years' of Omri's reign 'in Tirzah' was added to the term of '12 years' (v.²³). With such variations the chronology of this period is under vexed dispute. Lewy (*Chronologie*, 22 f.) supports the dating of original \mathfrak{G} . Stade's critical discussion in *SBOT* is sceptical as to final conclusions as between \mathfrak{H} and \mathfrak{G} . He wisely remarks that "the numbers given in cc. 16 and 22 by \mathfrak{H} and \mathfrak{G} show at how late a period the Book of Kings and the dates contained in it were still being worked over." His statement that "the paragraph on Jehoshaphat is more appropriate after 16²⁸ than it is after 22⁴⁰," is not supported by the usual form of the history. On the other hand the Greek editor felt that in view of the history of Ahab and Jehoshaphat in ch. 22 the latter should be previously introduced in formal terms. Begrich (*Chron.*, 178) would reduce the 22 years of Ahab to 20, arguing that v.^{29b} is secondary in view of the repeated 'Ahab ben Omri.'

VV.²³⁻²⁸. The reign of Omri of Israel. Cf. *Ani.*, viii, 12, 5. It is a sad loss to secular history that we possess only these few verses in record of the most capable of the North Israelite monarchs. His is the only name of an Israelite king in Mesha's inscription, which records Omri's 'afflictions' upon Moab for 'many years,' but does not name 'his sons.' After the passing of the dynasty the usurper Jehu was known to the Assyrians as 'son of Omri,' as in Shalmaneser III's obelisk inscription, *bis* (842 B.C.). Half a century later Adadnirari IV

in his Calah inscription calls Israel 'the land of Omri,' a geographical designation repeated (733-732 B.C.) by Tiglath-pileser III; see *CP* 304, 306; *AB* 459, 462, 465. We learn below (v.³¹) that Omri's son Ahab married Jezebel, daughter of Ethbaal, priest-king of Sidonia, himself a capable monarch; the alliance was doubtless of political purpose to counteract the growing power of Damascus, which was to 'afflict' Israel in his son's day. Only the foundation of his new capital, Shômerôn, the Samaria of the VSS, in a central and commanding position (see Smith, *HG* ch. 17), is recorded for the reign, with petty detail as to its purchase. As for the new capital, which was to rank with, or rather politically beyond, Jerusalem as first among the cities of Palestine, the one-time doubt as to Omri's creation of the city, and the interpretation of the statement that he *built up the hill . . . Shomeron* as of a rebuilding, are now dissipated by the results of the Harvard excavations at modern Sebastiyeh, which show that the lowest levels of remains belong to Omri's construction.¹ The city was to give its name to the whole province in the Assyrian empire (*cf.* the local usage, II. 17²⁴, etc.), and so the prophet Hoshea always designates his home-land.

VV.²⁹⁻³⁴. Introduction to the reign of Ahab of Israel. *Cf. Ant.*, viii, 12-13, 1. For native precedents for marriage with a foreign princess and the influence exerted by such queens on politics and religion in the ancient world *cf.* 11¹², 15¹³. The prophetic tradition memorializes Jezebel as spearhead of propaganda in Israel for the peculiarly fanatical Phœnician religion; see E. Meyer, 'Phœnicia,' *EB* 3740 ff.; *GA* 2, 2, ch. 3; G. Contenau, *La civilisation phénicienne*, ch. 2; F. Cumont, *Les religions orientales dans le paganisme romaine* (ed. 4, 1929); L. B. Paton, 'Phœnicians,' *ERE*. For the part of royal women in politics in that ancient field see A. Goetze, *Kleinasien* (*HA*, Abt. 3, 1, 3, 3, 1), 80 ff. The battle was on between the God of Israel and the foreign Baal, the

¹ See Lyon, Reisner, Fisher, *Harvard Excavations at Samaria* (1924), with subsequent reports in *QS*. For summaries of results see Dussaud, 'Samaria au temps d'Achab,' *Syria*, 1925, 314 ff.; J. W. Jack, *Samaria in Ahab's Time* (1929); Olmstead, *HPS* 369 ff.; Watzinger, *DP* 1, 97 ff. (all these with illustrations); Abel, *GP* 2, 443 ff.; Galling, *BR* 438 ff.; Barton, *AB* pl. 29; also for earlier literature Montgomery, *The Samaritans*, ch. 2.

first long step in the development of Israel's religion since the desert days; the national as well as the religious spirit was appealed to by the reaction of prophets and their guilds. According to Josephus's transcript of Menander of Ephesus' annals of the Phœnician kings (*C. Ap.*, i, 18) Ittobaal (Ἰθώβαλος—see Note), Ethbaal of \mathfrak{H} , is recorded as having seized the throne by violence and reigning for 32 years; he is entitled 'priest of Astarte,' and this sacerdotal origin may well explain Jezebel's extreme zeal in spreading her religion in the land of her adoption. This king's title as *king of Sidonia* (see Comm., 11⁵) is historically correct, even as is for Solomon's age the title of Hiram I as 'king of Tyre' (5¹⁵). 'Sidonians' was the older and more comprehensive name of the Phœnicians (as in Homer), and when the Tyrian kings gained ascendancy over Sidon, they assumed the larger title and its dignity; Josephus here entitles Ethbaal properly as 'king of Tyrians and Sidonians.' The epigraphic title of Hiram II (*ca.* 738 B.C.) was 'king of Sidonians' (*CIS* I, no. 5; *HNE* 419; *NSI* no. 11), as it was much later of Tabnit priest of Astarte, *ca.* 300 B.C. (*HNE* 417, *NSI* no. 4). For these titles see Cooke, pp. 53 f.; Meyer, *GA* 2, 2, 63 ff.; for the history Contenau, pp. 69 ff. (chronological tables, pp. 384 ff.), Meyer, ch. 2 (tables, pp. 436 ff.); Olmstead, *HPS* 368 ff. Meyer dates Ittobaal *ca.* 887–856, Olmstead 889–867. V.³² records Ahab's erection of *an altar to the Baal in the Baal's house, which he built in Samaria*; no remains of this temple have been found; it was probably part of the *enceinte* of Ahab's magnificent palace (*cf.* 22³⁹), easily distinguished from that of Omri's, and one which a recent authoritative statement describes as "incomparably the finest construction of the kind that has been found anywhere in Palestine" (*QS* 1936, 61).

Apart from these few facts bearing upon the alien elements of religion that Ahab introduced and the brief summary in 22³⁹, whatever official records of the reign that may have existed have been replaced by the following lively stories of the prophets, which indirectly throw abundant light upon the history of the reign. The one exception is v.³⁴, recording a unique local item, that of the rebuilding of Jericho (apparently as unimportant or too brutal it is ignored by \mathfrak{S}^L and Josephus). It is introduced with the first occurrence of the

archival note *in his days* (see *JBL* 53 [1934], 49). The massive fortifications of Jericho had lain in ruins since the destruction assigned to Joshua by Biblical tradition, although it still remained a settlement (Jos. 18²¹, Jud. 3¹³, 2 Sam. 10⁵). The present rebuilding was probably due to royal auspices, so Sanda suggests, as integral to Ahab's operations against Mesha of Moab; in the concluding summary of the reign Ahab is celebrated as a builder of cities. Jericho has been the object of two notable enterprises: the first by Sellin and Watzinger, 1907-09 (see their *Jericho*, 1913); the second by Garstang, since 1929, whose reports have appeared in *QS* 1930 and later, and more fully in *Liverpool Annals of Art and Archæology* (Reports I-III in vols. 19, 20 [1932-33]); see the summaries in Albright, *APB* 30 f., 55; Watzinger, *DP* 1, 55, 100; Abel, *GP* 2, 357 ff. Our memorandum, at least for a modest rebuilding of the city at this period, is borne out by these excavations; according to Garstang (*QS* 1932, 153): "The outer fortifications of the city . . . were not restored until the second phase of the Iron Age, about 900 B.C." According to the narrative with the usual translation of the prepositions, *Hiel* [Grr. preserve the full form *Ahiel*] *the Bethelite built Jericho; he laid its foundations in his eldest son Abiram, and set up its doors in his youngest son Segub*. The mng. of the prep. 'in' is obscure. \S Ψ AV translate literally as above; the Grr. have *in* in the first case, the dative without the preposition in the second; \mathfrak{T} expands after the first sentence: "he killed his eldest son A. when he built it, and he killed his youngest son S. when he set up its doors." RVV translate with 'with the loss of,' JV with 'with,' Chic. B. with 'upon'; Moffatt best renders the mng. of \mathfrak{H} (*cf.* 2²³, בנפשו, 'at the cost of his life.' But the method of the penalty expressed by the editor as fulfilment of Joshua's curse (Jos. 6²⁶) is obscure. According to Rashi and successors (see Poole) Hiel lost all his sons by divine visitation. The Targumic interpretation, that he killed his sons, comes closest to the current modern explanation, according to which we have here a case of foundation sacrifice with its inaugural counterpart; *cf.* H. C. Trumbull, *The Threshold Covenant* (1896), 46 ff. Such ritual devotion has appeared to be substantiated by archæological finds of bodies,

but particularly of infants immured in building foundations; see at length Cook, *Religion of Anc. Palestine*, 82 ff. (with extensive citation of similar phenomena throughout the ancient world), Graham and May, *Culture and Conscience . . . in Anc. Palestine*, 77 f., and so, of recent commentators, Šanda and Barnes. But there has been strong reaction against this sacrificial interpretation of house-burials; see Watzinger, *DP* I, 72, stating that only the burial of infants was the usual practice. At the more distant Tepe Gawra, in the old Assyrian land, only child-burials were found in the buildings, with one possible exception of a foundation sacrifice (E. A. Speiser, *Excavations at Tepe Gawra*, 1935, 25, 140 ff.). In his *Comm.* Kittel takes strong ground against the theory, and most recently P. Thomsen has expressed his scepticism: "zweifelhaft ist die Deutung einiger Funde als Bau- oder Gründungsoffer" (*Palästina u. seine Kultur*, 51). It remains wisest, with Kittel, Benzinger, Skinner, to refer the statement to fatalities in the builder's family, which the popular mind interpreted as fulfilment of an original curse. This tradition was independent of the book of Joshua, but it induced the final editor of that book to incorporate the note of fulfilment in 6²⁶; then here, in reverse, our editor cites Joshua to prove the *finale* of the curse; it was this interest that made the editor preserve the unimportant item.

There follows, ch. 17-22³⁸, the long insertion of prophetic story bearing upon the reign; the usual formula for its conclusion is given in 22³⁹⁻⁴⁰. Those stories give full details of the wars with Damascus and their varying results. But there is not a word of the first encounter of Israel with the might of Assyria, in 854/853 B.C., on the field of Karkar, where Ahab fought among Ben-Hadad's allies against Shalmaneser III. The victor records in his Monolith inscription the presence of 'Ahab the Israelite' with '2000 chariots, 10,000 men' (*KB* I, 151 ff.; *CP* 294 ff.; *ARA* I, §611; *AB* 458). This is the first extraneous reference by name to an Israelite; later the Mesha stone names his father.

Ch. 15. 33. [ישראל] כל: absent in similar formulas below, but the same nationalistic expression at 12¹⁻¹⁶, 16¹⁷; 3 MSS, OGrr. om. (*cf.* *BH*), but the deletion was due to later Jewish objection.--
34. ירבעם: Grr.+ 'son of Nebat'; the same variation in 16¹⁸;

see St.'s note there with statistics of the variant usages, and with proper hesitation in correcting \mathfrak{H} .

Ch. 16. 1. For the name Jehu see Note, II. 9².—אל: Grr., \mathfrak{H}^H 'by the hand of' = v.⁷; similar variation 21²⁸.—2. The consecution of grammatical persons, vv.²⁻³, is harsh; but the Gr. variations are arbitrary.—2. בהשאתם: Grr. = בנהליהם of vv.^{13, 26}.—3. מבעיר: 2 MSS מבער; Piel is demanded, cf. 14¹⁰.—6. אלה: the spelling אלא is expected for the caritative, as at 4¹⁸.—7. הניבא: 3 MSS, OGrr. om.; absent in v.¹.—ועל ועל: \mathfrak{C}^H \mathfrak{C}^H \mathfrak{C}^H om.; 9 MSS, \mathfrak{C} על, to be preferred.—ועל אשר: for adversative use of the prep. and the conjunctive phrase, as adopted above, see BDB 754b, 758a, GB 586b, 589a.—8. בשנת xxvi שנה: so vv.^{23, 29}, II. 8²⁵, 9²⁹, 15¹⁷; acc. to Begrich (pp. 179, 182 f.) this use is characteristic of one of his Chronicles.—9. עבדו: \mathfrak{C} \mathfrak{C}^L om., by misunderstanding of the official title.—ומרי: the VSS, Jos. speak unanimously for 'Zamri,' presenting the older vocalization. The element is ancient, appearing in the Amarna letters, occurring on a Palestinian seal (Diringer, *IAE* 210), and on Akk. tablets from the ancient palace of Mari, addressed by Hammurabi to 'Zimri-ilim' (A. Parrot, *Syria*, 1937, 74 f.; 1939, 97 ff.). The root, as *dmr*, is frequent in S. Arab. names (*NPS* 2, 46 f.), with its mng. much debated (see Lexx.; Šanda, 'protection'). But it is to be identified with Aram. (Syriac) *dmr* with sense of 'awe, wonder.' Cf. Phœn. *Zēvs Δεμαρούς*, acc. to Philo of Byblos (*Eus., Præp. ev.*, i, 10, 31). C. Clemen correctly recognizes (*MVÄG* 42, Heft 3 [1939], 66) philological identity with Syrian Nahr ed-Damur (named also in Polybius, v, 68).—ארצא: Noth, *IP* 230, following Nöldeke, identifies with Arab. 'aradatu, 'wood-worm,' but it is doubtless from the root רצה, 'to be gracious,' with prosthetic א (as common in Aram. before such a consonantal combination); cf. the divine name ארקשה, 'Favour-of-Reshep,' in the Zenjirli Hadad inscr., also the Palm. *n. dei*, ארצו. 2⁰: St. deletes; but the term is official.—11. במלכו כשבתו על כסאו: = 'at his accession, at his ascending the throne': vs. St. the second vocable is not superfluous.—לא השאיר: בעשא שנה, v.¹²: OGrr. om. by homoiotel.—נאליו: the exceptional pl. is prob. to be read in II. 10¹¹.—רעהו: pl., and so at 1 Sam. 30²⁶; later spellings are רעיו, רעיו.—12. אל: read על with 4 MSS=Grr.; the same correction in v.¹³.—ביר: \mathfrak{C} \mathfrak{C}^H και προς= \mathfrak{C}^H .—13. הטאו ואשר: OGrr. om.—a clumsy insertion.—14. וכל: 1 MS, \mathfrak{C} om.

15. "In the 27th year of Asa king of Judah": \mathfrak{C} (B *al.*), \mathfrak{C} om.; \mathfrak{C}^L 'in the 22d year' MSS *c*₂ *i*, 'in the 31st year,' so agreeing with v.²³; the variations display the unreliability of the Grr.—שבעת ימים: \mathfrak{C} (B *a*₂) \mathfrak{C} '7 years'; this error in place of 'days' accounts for the plus 'in the 20th year of Asa' in \mathfrak{C} (B A *al.*) \mathfrak{C} , v.⁶; other Grr. give a variety of numerals.—16. העם התרים: *n.b.* the variation in number, *ad sensum*; the Gr. 'the people in the camp' induced by 'in the camp,' *inf.*—כל ישראל: \mathfrak{C} Hex.,

'in Israel'; Ⓜ^{L} 'the people'; the changes were made because the ideal All-Israel was not involved; *cf.* 15³³.—עזרי: the element is doubtless Arabic; *cf.* 'Omar and its frequency in S. Arab. (*NPS* 2, 109). Omri and Zimri were evidently mercenaries of non-Israelite stock. Gr. texts by unfortunate confusion have *Zαμβρετ*, exc. Ⓜ^{L} *Αμβρετ* (= Ⓜ^{L} Ⓜ^{H}), which Rahlfs (*SS* 3, 285) regards as the original Gr. form.—18. ארמון: *Grr.*, 'cave'= Ⓜ^{H} ; Ⓜ^{L} 'chamber'; Ⓜ^{H} Ⓜ^{L} 'palace'; Ginsberg insists properly on 'fortress,' *JBL* 62 (1943), 113 f. For etymology see E. A. Speiser, *JQR* N.S. 14 (1924), 329, as from root 'to cast foundation'; *cf.* *Akk. rimītu*, 'dwelling.' The word in the same connexion occurs at II. 15²⁵.—19. הַמְּצָאוֹ Or. Kt. and Kr.=Ginsb., *BH*; to be accepted *vs.* Occ. Kr. הַמְּצָאוֹ (also הַמְּצָאוֹ=Bār); *VSS* have pl.—אשר עשה להטיא: 8 MSS הטא for עשה; *Grr.*=אשר הטיא, the usual formula; the whole v. is clumsy.—20. קשרו אשר קשר: II. 15¹⁶.—21. להצי: to be omitted with *Grr.*, Ⓜ^{H} ; a dittogr. of הצי [ישראל].—תקני: *Grr.* and *Jos.* support original vocalization as 'Tabni'; Šanda *cf.* *Akk. 'Tabni-Ea'*; for the name *cf.* הַבְּנִית in the Phoen. Tabnith inscr.—גינת: also Ginsb. variant גינת; 13 MSS גינת= Ⓜ^{H} Ⓜ^{L} =גינת; *Grr.*, Γωπαθ, -ωθ, etc.—22. יהוק: in active sense, 'to prevail over,' as at Jer. 20⁷, 2 Ch. 28²⁰; *cf.* König, *Syntax*, §§210 ff. *Grr.* texts of v.^b early suffered abbreviation by homoiotel. of repeated vowels; Ⓜ^{L} Ⓜ^{H} Ⓜ^{L} Ⓜ^{H} ; see Rahlfs, *SS* 3, 67 f.—23. יהודה: Ⓜ^{L} Ⓜ^{H} om.—24. ההר שֶׁמֶרֶן: 'the Hill Shomeron'; there is no reason to elide 'ש' (with St.), or either the art. or ההר (with Šanda).—שֶׁמֶרֶן: *Bibl. Aram.*, שֶׁמֶרֶן; *Syr.*, שֶׁמֶרֶן; *Akk. Samerina*, also *Sabara'in* (*Bab. Chron.* B, col. I, line 28; *KAT* 2, 276, *CP* 210); *Grr.* (except in this one v. for exactness) *Σαμάρεια*. For the process of the initial vowel, $\hat{a} > \delta$, see Harris, *Development of the Canaanite Dialects*, 43 ff. For the process of the final vowel, $\hat{a} > ay > i$, by 'imālah, *cf.* Brock, *GVG* 1, 141 ff. For place-names in -ām-, -ayim-, -īm-, and -δn-, -ayin-, -in-, see Borée, *AOP* 50-67, with full lists. For Šamerón/*Šamerayin cf.* modern Syrian *Libnēn* < *Libnān*, along with *Bibl. Lebanon*. The final nasal with preceding varying vowel as above noted (*cf.* שְׁעֵלִיבִים 4⁹) is demonstrative, parallel to -ān in S. Arabic; see *Comm.*, ch. 11, n. 2, on *Malkam*/*Milkom*. Place-names in -δ with loss of the nasal are of similar origin, e.g., Shilo. In this v. there is wide variety in the Gr. spellings of the repeated name. In the first case *OGr.*, followed by *Hex.*, played on the man's name with *Σεμερων*, so B, and with *Σαεμηρων* in the second case; but Ⓜ^{L} has *o* for the first vowel= Ⓜ^{L} . The *n. pr.* occurs elsewhere as clan-name, also on a Palestinian bulla (*IAE* 142), and in name-composition. There also appear forms accommodated to the place-name, e.g., *Σομμηρ*= Ⓜ^{L} , Ⓜ^{H} , 'Somer.' There is no reason to correct the Heb. vocalization of the place-name so as to gain *a* in the first syllable, and so to relate the name more closely to 'Shemer' (so e.g., Döller, Šanda, and the queried correction in *BH*); the play on the man's name remained, whatever was the vocalization

of the derivative. The new name probably involved the participial sense of 'Watch-tower,' with Smith, *HG* 346.—**26.** הַמְּאִירוֹ: the correct Kr. הַמְּאִירוֹ=Kt. of many MSS.—אלהי ישראל—B *al.*, Ⓢ om.—**27.** אִשֶׁר 1^o: 40 MSS Ken., deR. pref. וּבֹל=Grr.; St. denies its originality (otherwise *BH*); it was indeed suitable for Omri's activities, but the word was often carelessly introduced in similar cases, e.g., 15³¹, and see Bär's note on II. 15³⁶.—אִשֶׁר עִשָּׂה 2^o: om. with OGr.—**28.** אִיזַבְבֵּל: tradition of older vocalization in Αχιαβ, Jer. 29^{21f.}, as also in the name of a nephew of Herod, 'Αχιαβος (*Ant.*, xv, 7, 8). The Heb. name now appears on the Shebna seal from Tell ed-Duweir (*IAE* 214).

29. OGr. date the accession in the 2d year; Gr. MSS also greatly abbreviate the text.—**30.** מַלְכִי: OGr. prefix κ. επονηρευσατω =וירע, as in v.²⁵, approved by Burn., *BH*, but it is an expansion to accentuate Ahab's wickedness (*cf.* St.).—**31.** הַתְּקִלָּה: the interrogative appears to have been first noticed by the Renaissance scholars (see Poole), with the result, "et fuit, nonne leve fuit ire ipsum," etc., and so AV^{mg.} The VSS all paraphrase; since Klost. the accepted amendment is הַתְּקִלָּה, 'the lightest thing' (e.g., St., *BH*); but change is unnecessary. The syntax, with interrogative in place of conditional particle is quite possible; *cf.* Eze. 8¹⁷, and see Burn.—אִיזַבְבֵּל: the first syllable is to be interpreted as abbreviation of אִיזַבְבֵּל; see H. Bauer, *ZAW* 1933, 89, n. 1, who *cf.* אִיעִוֹר=Αχιεξερ, Num. 26³⁰; *cf.* also the possible play on the name אִיזַבְבֵּל < אִיזַבְבֵּל. The interpretation of the second element has varied because of the questioned mng. of the root; see Note on זָבַל, 8¹³. As there the present element has the primary sense of 'exaltation.' Light is now cast by the Ugaritic texts, where *zbl* occurs with the mng. of 'prince,' e.g., *zbl b'l 'rs*, 'the Prince, Lord of the earth,' *zbl ym*, 'the Prince Sea,' with its parallel, 'Prince River'; see Gordon, *Ugar. Handbook*, 1, §9, 45, and at length Albr.'s extensive art., *JPOS* 1936, 17 ff. A pejorative sense may have been introduced by playing upon Arab. and Akk. (?) *zibl*, 'dung'; *cf.* the process 'Baal-zebul' > 'Baal-zebul,' II. 1². In *Syria*, 1935, 185, n. 1, Virolleaud has proposed identity with the repeated phrase in the first published Ugaritic epic, *iy zbl*, 'where is Zbl?' (the passages cited by Gordon, *ib.*, §12, 5). But such a name as original is impossible; there might be in the Biblical form a taunting nickname.—אִיזַבְבֵּל: Grr., Ιεθεβααλ, etc.; Jos., *C. Ap.*, i, 18, Ιθωβαλος, which transcription, on good Phœn. authority=אִיזַבְבֵּל, 'With-him-Baal'; *cf.* the abbreviated form of the name of a Sidonian king, Tuba'lu, in Sennacherib's Prism inscr., ii, 44 (*CP* 340; *ARA* 2, no. 239). See Harris, *Phœn. Gram.*, Glossary. For such prepositional name-formations *cf.* הַמְּאִירוֹ עִשָּׂה, and see Noth, *IP* 32.—**32.** בֵּית הַבַּעַל Grr., εν οικω τ. προσοχθισματων αυτου=Ⓢ^H; προσοχθ. renders רָעַשׁ as applied to Astarte and Chemosh in II. 23¹³.—**33.** הַמְּאִירוֹ: Grr., (το) αλσος, as at 15¹³.—וְיִוֹסֵף א' לַעֲשׂוֹת לַהַבְעִים: Ⓢ^L Ⓢ^L insert [τ. ποιησαι] παραργισματα, which as כַּעֲשִׂים is introduced into the text by

Kit., St., Šanda, *BH* (with ?); but *cf.* Burn.'s note on the use of the noun (*e.g.*, II. 23²⁶). 𐤇 can well be preserved by treating the second infinitive as gerundial, "he did still more in provoking."—**34.** 𐤇 om., Jos. ignores the v.—ביטיו: B† om.—היאל: Grr., Αχιηλ = 𐤇 = אחיאל; *cf.* אחרום/חירום, 5¹⁵.—יריחה: also MSS יריחו; for the final vowel and Kt. *cf.* גלה, שילה.—שניב: Kt., שנוב Kr. = many MSS, and so at I Ch. 2²¹; Grr. = Kr. ; the element is a S. Arab name (*NPS* 2, 401).

CC. 17–19. The first part of the Elijah cycle. *Cf. Ant.*, viii, 13, 1–7.¹

Ch. 17. Elijah's sudden appearance and announcement to Ahab of the coming drought (v.¹); the divine provision for him at the Wady Cherith (vv.²⁻⁷); the Phoenician woman's care of him by divine provision, and his miracle of resuscitation of her son (vv.⁸⁻²⁴). V.¹. "With the eagle-like suddenness which characterizes all his movements Elijah appears abruptly before Ahab with the announcement of a drought which is to continue for some years, and not to be removed except in accordance with his prophetic word" (Skinner, p. 223). For his equally mysterious disappearances *cf.* 18¹², II. 2. It is held by some commentators (*e.g.*, Klostermann, Benzinger) that the original introduction to the story, giving the motive of Elijah's appearance, has been lost; but, again with Skinner: ". . . it is doubtful if any introduction would not weaken the dramatic effect of the great prophet's advent on the scene." Elijah's chosen self-expression, 'before Whom I stand' (also 18¹⁵) designates him solemnly as YHWH's courtier (*cf.* 1²). The true Oriental reserve of the story also appears in the point that not until the bidding, *hide thyself*, do we learn that the prophet had to flee from the king. Elijah is bluntly introduced without even a patronymic (Grr. add the

¹ For linguistic and literary criticism of these prophet-cycles see Burn., pp. 207 ff., 'Narratives of the Northern Kingdom.' To the literature noted in Int., §14, b, n. 1, are to be added for the historical environment of Elijah and Elisha the following: Ewald, *HI* 4, 63 ff.; Kittel, *GVI* 2, §§30–9; Cook, *CAH* 3, cc. 17–20; Lods, *Israël*, 485 ff., 513 ff.; Olmstead, *HPS* cc. 24 ff.; Robinson, *HI* ch. 16; Morgenstern, 'The Historical Antecedents of Amos' Prophecy,' pt. 3 of his *Amos Studies*; for the prophets under discussion Gunkel, *Elias, Jahwe u. Baal* (1906), and his *Geschichten von Elisa* (1922); James, *Personalities of the O.T.*, cc. 9, 10. For the later Jewish traditions see Hamburger, *RE*, and *JE*, s. *vv.*, and L. Ginzberg, *The Legends of the Jews*, vol. 4.

reverential title 'the prophet,' which he was not technically—*cf.* Amos), as *the Tishbite, of Tishbe of Gilead*—so with the Gr. (*cf.* Jos.), *vs. T*, of the settlers of Gilead, with variation of vocalization (see Note). The Gileadite Tishbe is to be distinguished from the Galilæan Θεσβη, 'on the right of Kadesh of Naphtali,' the ancestral home of Tobit's family (Tob. 1¹). For possible identification with el-Istib, 13 km. N of the Jabbok on Jebel Ajlūn, on the southern slope of which locality lie remains of a chapel of Mar Elias, see Buhl, *GAP* 257; Döllner, *GES* 223 f.; Abel *GP* 2, 486. The site was early so identified, and was visited by the pilgrim Sylvia in the fourth century: "euntes aliquandiu per uallem Iordanis super ripam fluminis ipsius . . . ad subito uidimus ciuitatem sancti prophetæ Heliae, id est Thesbe, unde ille habuit nomen Helias Thesbites. Inibi est ergo usque in hodie spelunca, in qua sedit ipse sanctus" (*Peregrinatio*, ch. 16, in *CSEL* 39, 58). The indefinite *these years* is further precised at 18¹ⁿ, in which the dating *in the third year* dates the recurrence of rain; *i.e.*, normal conditions would have been restored in the third year. The 'three and a half years' to which the term is extended in Lu. 4²⁵, Ja. 5¹⁷ followed Jewish tradition (*Yalkut Shimeoni*, see B. Weiss on Luke). Was the extra half added to give space for the history in ch. 18⁷? It has been observed that 3½ years, half of a sabbatic period, represented a mystical cycle of disaster; *cf.* Dan. 7²⁵, etc., and see Montgomery, *ad loc.* This exceptional drought is corroborated by Josephus's citation from Menander in the latter's 'acts of Ithobalos, king of Tyre': "There was a drought in his reign, which lasted from the month of Hyperberetaios until the month of Hyperberetaios in the following year. But he made supplication to the gods, whereupon a heavy thunderstorm broke out." For the continuation of droughts over periods of years in Palestine see E. Huntington, 'Transformation of Palestine' (*Bull. Am. Geog. Soc.*, June, 1912), and his table of the rainfall recorded for 1846–1909, fig. 9 in App.; the dry period of 1868–74 is 'the worst in modern times' (p. 352). But Huntington, with his theory of deterioration of the Palestinian climate does not include notice of ancient tradition of such calamities. See also at length Dalman, *A. u. S.*, I, I, 194 ff. A parallel tradition of a drought is given in the Elisha cycle, II. 4³⁸ⁿ.

VV.²⁻⁷. Elijah is bidden by *the word of YHWH* (see Comm., 13¹): *Go from here . . . and hide thyself in the Wady Cherith, which is in front of the Jordan.* The wady in question, with its indefinite name (= 'cutting') has been located at many places, *e.g.*, by Robinson (*BR* 2, 28) as the deep and difficult Wady el-Kelt, W of Jordan, N of Jericho. But the story demands that Elijah fled out of Ahab's jurisdiction. Jerome places *Chorath* as 'a torrent across Jordan' (*Onom.*, 113, 18), following pilgrim tradition; this view is supported by the presumable meaning of the prep. as *to east of* (*e.g.*, Gen. 23¹⁹, other reff. in GB 649a). For the various identifications see Döller, *GES* 224 ff. The divine provision of the prophet's food was simply miraculous. Such a miracle has long aroused rationalistic doubts, and the word for *ravens* has been given other interpretations by change of vocalization; and so as 'merchants,' identified with a word at Eze. 27²⁷, and Kimchi notes such an interpretation; or as 'Arabs' (the reverse process has taken place in Jer. 3², where Heb. 'Arab' is rendered as 'crow' by Grr., §); a gentile interpretation appears in *Q* with the ethnic name '*Orabim*. Poole excoriates such interpretations in his day as due to 'morosa ingenia'; this rationalizing still survives, *e.g.*, in Barnes's Comm. Comparison has long been made with similar tales, classical and otherwise, of such feedings by animals, by Grotius, Keil, Gunkel in his *Elias*, 68, nn. 7-9, most recently by Frazer, *Folk-Lore in the O.T.*, pt. 3, ch. 14, noting the part played by the raven in ancient lore.

VV.⁸⁻²⁴. In retiring later to *Sarephath of Sidon* Elijah still keeps out of Ahab's jurisdiction. The place is the Gr. Sarepta (*e.g.*, Lu. 4²⁶); the name survives in modern Sarafend, 7 miles S of Sidon, near the coast, while remains of the ancient seaport exist on the shore below; see Dussaud, *La Syrie antique et médiévale*, 42. Note that it is Phœnician testimony that corroborates this tradition of a long and widespread drought. Oriental generosity is shown by the woman's readiness to give a drink of water to the stranger (*cf.* Mt. 10⁴²), but she is embarrassed by the request for food. For the *jar* and the *cruse* (v.¹²), see A. M. Honeyman, *PEQ* 1939, 81, 89. The *two sticks* is equivalent to the English 'a couple,' Germ. 'ein Paar' (*cf.* Am. 1¹). In the same v. the Grr. understood the

Heb. of *my son* as pl., 'my sons' (as the Kt. can also be interpreted), then continued the pl. in v. 13, and also rendered *her household* (v. 15) with 'her children.' But only *the* (one) *son of the mistress of the house* is named below (v. 17); the pl. of the Grr. appears to have been induced by the expansive word *house/household*, which includes servants; change indeed might be made in v. 15, with many comm., of *her house* to *her son*. The woman was a person of property, a householder, with a dwelling stout enough to have an *upper chamber* (v. 18), *i.e.*, a 'lean-to' on the roof; *cf.* the description of Elisha's quarters in similar circumstances, II. 4¹⁰, and see Dussaud, *Syria*, 1935, 350.

VV. 17-24. The story of the revival of the lifeless child has its parallel in numerous folk-tales concerning the gratitude of divine persons for hospitality rendered them, especially by poor people; *e.g.*, the story of Lot and his divine visitors, that of Philemon and Baucis, also numerous German tales cited by Gunkel (*Elias Jahve u. Baal*, 69, n. 12). The mother's passionate cry to Elijah (v. 18): *What is there between me and thee, O Man of God? Hast thou come into my home to record my sin and to slay my son?*, is expression of ancient religion, the 'Scheu vor Heiligkeit.' What had escaped divine notice before is now revealed by the discovery of a divine in her house, who has acted as detective of holiness; *cf.* Peter's discovery of his Lord's divinity (Lu. 5⁸), and the centurion's fear of him (Mt. 8⁸). Physical calamity was taken to point to human sin, to some case of 'hidden faults' (Ps. 19¹³); *cf.* the disciples' query about the man who was born blind (Jn 9²). The next to the last clause is generally translated 'to bring my sin to remembrance'; Moffatt, 'to call attention to some sin of mine'; Chic. B., 'to remind me of my iniquity.' But the meaning of the verb is 'to register,' *i.e.*, legally before Deity, and so Skinner interprets; such and such a sin becomes a matter of record before God, and judgment is immediately passed (*cf.* Dan. 7¹⁰). The praxis of the resuscitation of the child, *in whom there was no breath left* (v. 17) lay in this (v. 21) that the man of God *stretched himself upon the child three times*, along with a prayer to *my God*, that *the child's soul might return into him*. The treatment is identical with that of Elisha in his cure of a child, when "h

lay upon the child" at full length, etc., II. 4^{34f.} (*q.v.*). In similar fashion Paul revived (*ἐπέπεσεν αὐτῷ*) the youth Eutychus, who was taken up as dead from a fall (Acts 20^{9ff.}). Landersdorfer suggests that this was a kind of ritual praxis closely related to Babylonian incantations; but the praxis here is not of ritual order. The Gr., not understanding the verb of the praxis, translated with "he breathed into the boy"; but there is no reason, along with some critics, to change the Heb. here, or to accept the abbreviated text presented by OGr. at v.²²; see Note. It is somewhat an academic question whether the child actually died; it is not so specifically stated, and Josephus reasonably understands the case as one of apparent death. Cf. a similar act of resuscitation by Jesus (Mt. 9^{18ff.} = Mk., Lu.). Antiquity recognized that the fact of death was not certain until after a certain delay; cf. the raising of Lazarus, and the delay of Jesus till the third calendar day (Jn. 11). The woman's final confession, *Now I know*, etc. (v.²⁴) is the conviction of the mother's heart; what might have been a passing incident has become to her an abiding reality. Indirectly she recognizes Elijah's God, but the point she makes is that *the word of YHWH is in thy mouth of a truth* (so Moffatt, 'really': not, as generally, 'the word . . . is true'). The story is paralleled by Jesus' benefaction of the Syro-Phœnician woman (Mk. 7^{24ff.}). Here as also in the Gospel incident there is no evangelization of the alien; the Syrian Naaman voluntarily became a proselyte (II. 5^{17ff.}).

1. אֱלֹהֵי: for formation of such 'Bekenntnisnamen' in the ancient religions see Noth, *IP* 139 ff.; the name may have been an assumed religious alias. Ⓞ here and below *Ηλειου*; Ⓞ^L always *Ηλιας*, declinable; Grr., exc. Ⓞ^L, + 'the prophet.'—מְתָשְׁבִי: 'of the settlers of (Gilead),' a strange expression; Grr., *εκ Θεσβων*; Ⓞ^H 'from Tšbi'; Jos., *εκ πολεις Θεσσεβωνης*; accordingly read *מְתָשְׁבִי*; see Then. at length; but cf. Ew., *HI* 4, 64.—יְהוָה: Grr. with magnification + 'the God of Hosts'; some MSS om. foll. 'the God of Israel'; cf. the Gr. in v.¹⁴.—2. אֱלֹהֵי: Grr. = אֱלֹהֵי, and so v.⁸; the Gr. preferred precision, e.g., vv.^{10. 11. 12. 15}, etc.—3. מִהֵן: 'from here,' exceptional; cf. מִשָּׁם, v.¹³.—4. וּפְנֵית לך: Grr., Ⓞ^H om., but there is no reason, vs. St., to delete it.—5. וַיֵּלֶךְ: 1 MS Ken., Ⓞ om.; 1 MS Ken., OGr. om.; but the phrase 'to go and do' is usual, cf. v.¹⁵, and e.g., Mt. 9¹³, Lu. 10³⁷; 2⁰ is geographical.—וַיֵּעַשׂ: Ⓞ^L om.; on the Gr. rdgs. here cf. Rahlfs, *SS* 3, 242.—6. הָעַרְבִים: see Comm. above.—7. וּבְשֵׁר: 1⁰:

1 MS, OGrr. om.; ולרם 2⁰: 1 MS, OGrr. om.; emendation of \mathfrak{H} is accordingly made by some, as in correspondence with Oriental meals, e.g., by Klost., Kamp., St., BH; but the simplification may have been induced by Ex. 16^{8, 12}, so Benz., Sk.—9. צרפתה: so Mich., Bär, BH; Ginsb., צרפתה; cf. צרתנה, 4¹². The *n. loci*=Eg. *Darpata* (Albr., *Vocalization*, 42), Akk. *Ṣariptu*, Gr. *Σαρπητα*.— \mathfrak{S} : OGrr. om., prob. on ground that he did not legally dwell there, vs. St.'s approval of the excision.—אשה אלמנה: 'a certain widow'; cf. Ex. 16²⁰, Jud. 4⁴, Dan. 3⁸.—10. ויבא: OGrr. om.—אחריה: Gr., *αυτου αυτης*, and so v.¹¹, as though for *αυτης*; the correction in the latter place is accepted by some (e.g., Kamp., Kit., St.; BH *ft.*), with the laboured idea of *vice versa* corruption in \mathfrak{H} (so Šanda).—11. ליקחי: so the full radical impv. in Ex. 29¹, Eze. 37¹⁶, Pr. 20¹⁶; correction to לקחי, ostensibly after the Gr. (cf. St., BH), is not corroborated by the Gr. order of words.—12. \mathfrak{S} (exc. in the corrupt text of Ps. 35¹⁶): interpreted from ענה (e.g., v.¹³); Gr., *ενκαυφιας*=a cake baked in hot ashes; \mathfrak{T} as *מאונה*, 'anything,' accepted by Klost., BH as likely original, properly rejected by St.—שניים: 4 MSS om. the meagre figure.—13. ולך: MSS Ken., Ginsb., ולכי, in accord with the woman's dialect.—14. אלהי ישראל: OGrr. om. (cf. similar omission, v.¹), but to the point here, vs. St.; the omission of the nationalistic phrase was due to Hellenistic universalism.—תקלה: n.b. -ā, a case to be added to those given in GK §75, 6. חתן-ח, Kt., חתן: for the Kt. cf. 6¹⁹.—15. כדבר אליהו: OGrr. om., as in conflict with \mathfrak{H} היא הוה והיא—Kt., היא הוה, (the Kt. in some MSS): \mathfrak{K} r.=VSS, exc. Gr. A v, *αυτος κ. αυτη*; the original text was prob. הוא, and subsequent vocalization wrongly gave precedence to the prophet.—וביתה: prob. to be read ויבנה, cf. Gr.=ובניה; see Comm.—ימים: OGrr. om.; A c₂ \mathfrak{S} ¹¹ supply from Sym., Theod., with 'and from that day,' accepted by Šanda as *ומהיום ההוא*; St., Sk. om.; Kit. sugg. *יום יום* (cf. BH); but the indefinite word='for some time,' needs not to be faulted; cf. ויהי ימים, 18¹.—16. The v. is dependent upon v.¹⁶. צפתה השמן לא הסר: for similar predominance of gender of the *nom. regens* cf. Ewald, *Lehrb.*, §317, c. Such syntax does not appear for the preceding *קמה*, hence St. corrects the verb there to fem.; however, original grammar may be careless.—18. באה: 9 MSS pref. כי.—20. יהוה: OGrr. (\mathfrak{L} corrupt), *αμοι κυρια*, as though for \mathfrak{H} *אלי*.—אלי: Gr., *ο μαρτυς* (!), a variation that has caused attempts at rewriting, e.g., by Klost. (cf. BH), suggesting *יהוה* לא נמול יהוה—"should there not be a reward . . . ?"—מתגורר: the word=*anglice* 'boarder.'—21. ויתמרד: cf. וינהר, II. 4³⁵, and see discussion there; there is no reason on basis of Gr. *ενεφυσθησεν* to change to ויפח (cf. BH).—על קרבו=v.²²; a few MSS אל ק' =Gr. *εις αυτον*, exc. MS f, *εν αυτον*= \mathfrak{C} ; but נפש is the aura enveloping the person; cf. עלי in the refrain of Ps. 42-43.—22-23. הילך (v.²³) . . . וישמעו; reduced by \mathfrak{C} for mixed text of \mathfrak{L} see Rahlfs, SS 3, 242 f.) to *κ. εγγεμετα*

οὕτως κ. ἀνεβίωσεν, "and it was so, and he revived [so with MS u, Jos., vs. the corruption ἀνεβόησεν, e.g., B=Σ^H, "and he called to"] το παιδαριον, as though from original ויהי כן ויהי הילך; such a corrected text has been favourably regarded by some, e.g., St., BH; but it has arisen through haplog. of the similar phrases and then assimilation of על קרבנו, v.²¹, על קרבנו ויהי, v.²² (as 1 Heb. MS actually reads in v.²¹), ויהי 1⁰ then being read in doublet as ויהי.—24. עתה זה: the phrase also at II. 5²²; for the enclitic element cf. 14⁶. אמת: adverbial, as at Jer. 10¹⁰, Ps. 132¹¹. Σ^H has a marginal note, citing from Severus of Antioch, that (with play on the word) this child was the prophet Jonah ben Amittai, acc. to Hebrew authorities, and so Jerome, *Prolog. in Jonam*; see Field, also Poole, *ad loc.*

Ch. 18. The scene on Carmel. The drama falls into three acts: (1) vv.¹⁻¹⁹, the providentially arranged meeting of Elijah with king Ahab; (2) vv.²⁰⁻⁴⁰, the great convocation on Carmel, and YHWH's victory in the contest with the Baal; vv.⁴¹⁻⁴⁶, the coming of the great downpour of rain, and Elijah's triumphal escort of the king to his residence in Jezreel. For the fire from heaven see Additional Note below.

1. For the third year see Comm., 17¹. 2b. *And the famine being sore in Samaria*: in the Heb. syntax the sentence is subordinate to the following. VV.^{3, 4} give a parenthetical description of Obadiah, who was *Over-the-House*, i.e., of the king, for which title cf. 4⁶. He was one who *revered YHWH greatly*. His name is composed with the element 'ōbēd, 'servitor, worshipper,' a word also used of Baal's devotees (II. 10^{19ff.}). The name may have been assumed by the zealot, as probably was the case in Elijah's name. The virtue of this royal officer had been exhibited by his having concealed, in Jezebel's persecution of the national religion, *a hundred prophets . . . by fifties in the cave-region* (the last word in D, 'cave,' is generic). One of such regions is Mount Carmel, which is largely of chalk formation, abounding in caves, some 2000 of which have been counted, an abode of prehistoric man, and through history a resort of fugitives (cf. the story in 1 Sam. 24), and of Christian hermits.¹ This is the first,

¹ See Döllner, *GES* 228 f.; Abel, *GP* 1, 438 ff.; Barton, *AB* 131 f., and for a more recent review of the discoveries of prehistoric man's remains in the Palestinian caves, Albr., *SAC* 88 f. Supplementally there is to be added the vivid account in ch. 4 of McCown's *The Ladder of Progress in Palestine*.

although indirect, reference to a systematic persecution of the sons of the prophets, brought on by Jezebel's high-handed policy, as also to the existence of such large groups of their order.

VV.⁵⁻⁶ present the straits to which the *régime* was put by the drought for provisioning the royal horses and mules. The demand of the royal stables is illustrated by Shalmaneser III's figuring of the chariots of 'Ahab the Israelite' at 2000 (Monolith inscr., col. 2, 91, Rogers, *CP* 296; Barton, *AB* 458). The opening imperative should probably be expanded with the Grr.: *Come, let us go through the land*; cf. 1 Sam. 14¹⁻⁶. 7. Obadiah recognized (EVV *knew*) Elijah; he had never met him, but knew him by repute, possibly recognized him by his hair mantle (cf. II. 1⁸). 8-15. Obadiah deprecated the prophet's commission to him: *Go, tell thy lord: Here is Elijah!* Elijah's volatility, his sudden appearances and vanishings were known to all; upon himself the king would take revenge, if Elijah escaped summary arrest. But the plea may have been only a generous excuse; Obadiah was thinking of the prophet's safety. Ahab had been seeking everywhere for the fugitive prophet, even in foreign lands, laying every *régime* (see Note) and nation under oath in the search for him. For such adjurations, involving fearful execrations, cf. the Aramaic texts from Syrian Sūjīn of this order.² 15. Here occurs for the first time in Kings the divine name YHWH Sebaoth, elsewhere in the book five times, and only in prophetic utterances.³

16-19. Elijah's meeting with Ahab. The clash of words between him and the undaunted man of God is classical. The epithet, *Troubler of Israel*, is flung back in the king's teeth: ⁴ *I have not troubled Israel; but thou and thy father's house*, with added specific indictment of the court: *in your leaving* [with Grr. om. *the commandments of*] *YHWH and thy*

² The texts were first published by Dussaud, *CR* 1930, 155 ff., further treated by H. Bauer, *Afo* 8 (1932), 1 ff.; S. Ronzevalle, *Mél.*, 15, fasc. 7 (1931), 232 ff. For further execrations cf. the treaty imposed by Ashur-Nirari V upon the local Syrian king, 755 B.C., of which extracts are presented by Olmstead, *HA* 172 ff.

³ See W. W. Baudissin, *Kurios, als Gottesname im Judentum*, 1926-29.

⁴ The root 'to trouble' had some religious significance; cf. Josh. 6¹⁸, especially 7^{24ff.} with play upon the root meaning.

going after the Baals. 19. Elijah proceeds to a summary demand for a convocation of *all Israel* on *Mount Carmel*, along with *the prophets of the Baal*. The following figure *four hundred and fifty* is an evident intrusion from v.²². As intrusion also appears to be the reference to *the prophets of the Asherah four hundred*, on the ground that the followers of this cult are not mentioned in the subsequent story. But the argument that (the) Asherah was not a deity now falls to the ground; see Comm. on 15¹³, and on II. 23⁴ for the Ugaritic pairing of Baal and Asherah. Whether or not the clause is secondary, the reference to Jezebel's patronage of that deity is pertinent; her father was priest of the corresponding goddess Ashtart; see above on 16³¹. For *the eaters at Jezebel's table* cf. 2⁷; they were the queen's subsidized clergy. She was well within her extra-territorial rights (cf. 11¹¹), but she abused her wifely influence to persecute the native zealots. Those organized castes of the Baal and the Asherah with their orgiastic rites were an abhorrent innovation in Israel, and aroused the nationalistic-religious antipathy of the people at large, to whom Elijah and the fraternities of 'the sons of the prophets' gave voice and leadership. Elijah was right; not he but the responsible monarch was the innovator. This must be maintained as against many current scholars, who would hold that Israel never found its religion until the eighth century.

VV.²⁰⁻⁴⁰. The convocation of all Israel and the prophets of the Baal on Carmel. For this mountain promontory, called in Arabic *Jebel Mar Elyas*, see the BDD, Guérin, *Samarie*, ch. 60 (with ample historical citation); Smith, *HG* ch. 14, sect. iv; Döllner and Abel, cited above; also C. Klopp, *Elias u. Christentum auf dem Karmel* (1929). Šanda would precise the location of the present scene, the traditional site of which is pointed out at el-Muħraḳa ('place of burning'). This splendid complex, 1800 ft. above the sea at its top, must have been from of yore 'a holy mount.'⁵ Jamblichus in his life of Pythagoras (iii, 1) tells that his hero sojourned there;

⁵ In the Palestine List of Thutmose III immediately after 'k=Acco is listed rškdš=שקדש, 'Holy Mount,' according to some scholars (e.g., Abel, *GP* 1, 350 f.), our Carmel; but according to personal information from W. F. Albright the identity is not established.

Tacitus (*Hist.*, ii, 78) relates that there was a sanctuary there with altar but without image; Suetonius in his life of Vespasian (ch. v) records how he sacrificed there, and was given by the priests an oracle of his coming greatness; Elijah appears to have daringly chosen Pagan ground for his defiance of Ahab and the Baal. The mountain gives a dramatic setting for the appearance of *a little cloud the size of a man's palm coming up out of the sea*' (vv.^{42ff.}). **20.** The convocation of all [om. with Grr. *the sons of*] Israel has its parallel in the assembly at Shechem (ch. 12). **21.** The translation of Elijah's query to the people as given by EVV, *How long halt ye between two opinions?*, well expresses the sense; more exactly it means, *How long are ye hobbling* [so Moffatt, cf. GV FV] *at the two forks* (of the road), *i.e.*, hopping now on one leg, now on the other, before the dilemma. Grotius gives a capital parallel for the verb in the Gr. ἀμφοτερίζειν. For other interpretations see Note. Elijah is here using some popular phrase. It finely introduces, passing from the satiric to the serious, his peremptory demand: *If YHWH be the God (the Deity), follow him; and if the Baal, follow him!* And, as so often in history, *the demos answered him not a word.*

22. *And Elijah said to the people: I am left a prophet of YHWH's alone by myself.* Elijah is speaking to his present audience, contrasting himself with the hundreds of Baal-prophets; but his sense of utter loneliness is expressed again at 19¹⁴. VV.^{23ff.}. There follows the summons of the people to serve as jury in the ordeal between YHWH and the Baal, and this the people approves: *and it shall be, the God who answers by fire, he is the God (=the Deity).* The Baal-folk had the first choice. **26.** With no response from their god, the prophets enacted some peculiar rite *at*, or rather *about* [not *upon* with AV] *the altar.* This is doubtless to be explained as some kind of limping dance; see Note, v.²¹. For the ritual dance in Phœnician religion Pietschmann notes (*Gesch. d. Phönizier*, 220) the report in Heliodorus (*Æthiopica*, iv, 17) of a raving dance in honour of Herakles celebrated by Tyrian merchants, and a Phœnician 'Baal of the Dance' (*b'l mrkd*) is known from classical texts (Harris, *Grammar*, 88, 147). There have pertinently been compared the 'encompassing of the altar' in Ps. 26⁶ (cf. Gunkel, *ad loc.*), and the

running circumambulation of the sacred stone at Mecca at the Haj festival; *cf.* Wellhausen, *Reste arab. Heidentums*, 109 ff. D. B. Macdonald in his *Hebrew Literary Genius*, 35, further develops the comparison: "The fundamental idea in both words [*i.e.*, *haj* in both languages] is dancing around something and the essence of the Muslim *hajj* is a ceremonial dance around the Ka'ba at Mecca. This has to be done with a certain ritual-step which is described as resembling dragging the feet in deep sand." He proceeds to compare the similar 'limping about the altar' in the present passage. General reference may be made to W. O. E. Oesterley, *The Sacred Dance* (1923). 27. *And it was at noon that Elijah mocked them, and said: Cry with a loud voice, for he is God!* The sequence of the following clauses reads practically the same in EVV, *e.g.*, JV: *either he is musing, or he is gone aside, or he is on a journey, or peradventure he sleepeth, and must be awaked.* The ascription to the deity of musing is rather absurd (an interpretation from the late special meaning of the root used of religious 'study' of the Scriptures); rather, *he has some business or conversation.* The item, *he is gone aside*, has been best explained by Rashi (and so Thenius) as a euphemism, *i.e.*, to relieve himself (*cf.* Germ. 'Abort'), and this interpretation is reinforced for Rashi by his addition to the next clause, *he has a journey on hand, i.e.*, 'to the privy.' See Notes at length. Finally the 'waking up' of the deity is illustrated by an Ugaritic text (Virolleaud, *Syria*, 1929, pl. lxii), in which after each one of a series of choral stanzas and following a god's name occurs the choric "he has waked up" (*hn 'r*); see Montgomery *JAOS* 55 (1935), 89 ff. Elijah's satire in a nut-shell is the raciest comment ever made on Pagan mythology. 28. A stage in the Baal-ritual is enacted at noon: *They cut themselves after their manner with knives and lances, until the blood gushed out upon them.* This bloody rite in extreme cases of propitiation of a deity is frequently referred to in the O.T.: Hos. 7¹⁴ (with correction of 𐤇), Mic. 4¹⁴ (?), Jer. 16⁶, 41⁵ (a case of actual practice of the rite by Jeremiah's co-religionists), 47⁵ (the rite ascribed also to Philistia); the custom is proscribed by the Law (Dt. 14¹, Lev. 19²⁸). A close territorial parallel to the present scene is that described by Lucian as practised by the Syrian Galli of his

day: "these gash their arms and turn their backs to be lashed" (*De Dea Syra*, 50). For such widespread rites in antiquity see Poole, *ad loc.*, W. R. Smith, *Rel. of the Semites*, 303; Dhorme, *L'Évolution religieuse d'Israël*, I, 259 ff. The 'flowing of the blood upon them' was of the essence of the rite. 29. In the third act, *at the passing of noon they prophesied*. The verb can only be paraphrased in Christian language, which confines 'prophecy' to the higher levels of revelation; it might be translated colloquially with semantic right, *they enthused*; cf. Moffatt, 'raved,' Chic. B., 'worked themselves into a prophetic frenzy.' The action was that of 'the raving dervish' (Šanda), cf. 1 Sam. 10^{10ff.}, etc. For these prophets see further Comm. at end of the ch. They prophesied *until the offering of the* [EVV + evening] *oblation* [with RVV; Heb. *minḥāh*]: there are in the Law two oblations, Ex. 29^{38ff.}, Num. 28^{3ff.}, one in the morning, and one 'between the evenings,' which peculiar phrase has given much room for argument, as in the Mishnic *Pesaḥim*, v, 1. The morning oblation is referred to in II. 3²⁰ (the phrase as here). The second oblation was in the afternoon after three o'clock, and was the chief daily service for the people, so according to Josephus, *Ant.*, xiv, 4, 3, 'about the ninth hour,' so corresponding with Acts 3¹, timing the visit of Peter and John to the temple for prayer. Cf. Hamburger, *RE* 'Minchagabet,' Gunkel *Einl. in die Psalmen*, 177. This afternoon *minḥāh* was the chief public service in early Semitic custom, preserved in the Muslim service of the 'aṣr, celebrated about the same hour; cf. Ezr. 9^{4ff.}, Dan. 6¹¹, 9²¹ (see Montgomery, *ad locos*). There is no reason to suppose here a reflection from Jerusalemite practice or later Law. Also in II. 16¹⁵ in Ahaz's reign there is recorded the royal prescription for 'the morning burnt offering and the evening oblation'; see the extensive discussion in Nowack, *Arch.*, 2, 221, n. 1. *And there was no voice, and none to answer, and no attention!*—a rhetorical pyramiding of the earlier phrase, v. 26.

VV.³⁰⁻³⁵. Elijah rebuilds the altar of YHWH, sets upon it the wood and the dismembered bullock, and orders all to be doused with water three times, in addition to filling the surrounding trench with water. These details indicate the current knowledge of hocus-pocus practised in producing

sacred fire. The only considerable insertion in the text of the whole story is detected by many commentators in the reference to the *twelve stones*, with which the altar was built, *according to the number of the tribes of the sons of Jacob, to whom came the word of YHWH: Thy name shall be called Israel*. The reference to the twelve tribes appears to belong to later schematic history, and late seems to be the reference to the renaming of Jacob, citing P in Gen. 35¹⁰ (but *cf.* J in Gen. 32^{28f.}), repeated formulistically at II. 17³⁴. Further, v.^{30b}, *and he restored the ruined altar of YHWH*, appears to render unnecessary v.^{32a}, *and he built the stones into an altar in the name of YHWH*. These grounds have induced some critics, *e.g.*, Kamphausen, Kittel, Benzinger, Skinner, Eissfeldt to regard vv.^{31-32a} as an intrusion, a position denied however by Burney, Šanda. The classical reminiscence of the twelve tribes and the naming of Israel may well be of late origin. But it may be suggested that these vv. (which provoked the Gr. translators to considerable changes) include early variant notions as to the altar. The one (v.^{30b}) was of an altar of YHWH's rebuilt, after presumed destruction by Jezebel's fanaticism (*cf.* 19¹⁰); however not a single tradition points to any such occupation of Carmel, and a striking point of the story is that Elijah chose Baal's own ground to defy him. The other line of narrative (v.^{32a}) makes Elijah build a new altar, and so the original sequence may have been: (v.³¹) *And Elijah took stones*, (v.³²) *and he built the stones into an altar in the name of YHWH*, the final phrase 'in YHWH's name' (omitted by some Gr. texts) phrasing the benediction of the new altar. 32b. *And he made a trench according to the capacity of two seahs of seed*. The figure has aroused unsettled dispute. Rashi found a rectangle, 100×50 cubits, like the court of the tabernacle (Ex. 38^{9ff.}). Early commentators (see Poole), and so Šanda, made the item refer to the capacity of the trench for holding so much seed, but the quantum=*ca.* 26 litres, is too small. Bähr, Klostermann think of the 'well-known measure' of a double seah fixing the depth and breadth of the trench—a reasonable suggestion. Thenius, followed by Kittel, Benzinger, Skinner, compares the Mishnic term *בית סאה* (*e.g.*, *Shebi'ith*, iii, 2) used for the extent of land to be planted with a seah, *i.e.*, 1568 sq. metres (see Benzinger, *ad loc.*, and in

RPTK 1, 136), and so Kimchi, 'according to standard size'; but two such plots would make an absurdly large territory. The twelve jars full of water (v.³⁴) would seem to be an ample statement of the amount used. Similar expansion of the story appears in v.³⁵ with a duplicate: *The water ran about the altar, and, he filled the trench with water.* 36. 37. Elijah prays for a sign that *to-day it may be known that thou art God in Israel*, and with variant, *that thou, YHWH, art the Deity*. There is no reason to abbreviate the prayer with E^1 , followed by Benzinger; liturgical language is diffuse. YHWH is addressed as *God of Abraham, Isaac and Israel* (so the title in 1 Ch. 29¹⁸, 2 Ch. 30⁶), varying from Ex. 3⁶, etc.: 'God of A., I., and Jacob.' V.^{37b} offers a *crux interpretum*: EVV, *for thou didst turn their heart back again*, but RVV mng., JV . . . *their heart backward*. The latter interpretation is the true one, *it is thou* (emphatic pron. in Heb.), who didst so affect them, *i.e.*, the divine Providence, not the heathen Baal who was the cause of the people's backsliding, all *ad majorem gloriam Dei*, as in 'the hardening of the heart of the people' in Egypt, and the temptations in the desert. Such is Rashi's interpretation: "Thou gavest them place to depart from thee, and in thy hand it is to establish their heart toward thee." Kimchi, following Saadia, took the opposite interpretation: "Their heart, which was backward, thou wilt turn back." Such also was Lucian's interpretation, and this appears to be the prevailing exegesis, *e.g.*, of Kittel, Šanda, Eissfeldt, but not of Skinner. However not only is the past tense of the Heb. verb against this interpretation, but also the adverb *backward*, occurring at Gen. 9²³, 1 Sam. 4¹⁸, 2 Ki. 20^{10f.}, Is. 38⁸, is always used in that sense, never as 'back again.' 38. *And the fire of YHWH fell, and consumed the holocaust and the wood and the stones and the dust, licking up the water.* The 'fire of YHWH' appears at Num. 11^{1f.}, the 'fire of God' at II. 1^{12f.}; there is no reason to adopt, with Thenius, *al.*, the expansion (*cf.* Gen. 19²⁴) of the Grr., 'fire from the Lord (=Ⓣ) from heaven.' *The stones and the dust*—quite *de trop*!—is best explained by Clericus (cited by Keil), "redegit in calcem." 39. At sight of the miracle the people *fell on their faces*; *cf.* the fuller formula in Neh. 8⁶, "they bowed . . . and worshipped YHWH with their faces to the ground." This rite

is the same as the Muslim *sajdah* (see Hughes, *Dict. of Islam*, s.v. 'Prayer'), accompanying the cry, 'Allah akbar.' And such a confession is attributed to the people here: *YHWH, He is the God, YHWH, He is the God*. For the people He was the God as against the defeated rival Baal; only subsequently does the expression become absolute as of the sole Deity, as in Solomon's prayer (8⁶⁰) and in Islamic 'Allah.' **40.** Elijah promptly orders the arrest of the Baal prophets, and as leader in the bloody scene, he *brought them down to the Wady Kishon, and slaughtered them there*—down in the valley away from the sacred hill, and where flowing water might wash away the blood. For the ugly sequel, if authentic, the history of religion and politics down to our own day is sad apology.

VV.⁴¹⁻⁴⁶. Elijah's triumph. **41-42a.** Elijah courteously bids his monarch to refresh himself; there is no longer need of abstinence, for *there is the sound of the roar [EVV abundance] of the rain*. **42b-44a.** Elijah's vigil for the rain. *Elijah went up to the top of Carmel*, his servant 'going up' to a higher point (by implication) for his lookout. *Elijah bowed over to the ground and put his face between his knees*: Keil gives reference to travellers' notes recording a similar attitude used by modern dervishes; the attitude implies ecstatic absorption, the subject sees nothing, another must be his eyes. **43-44a.** He commands his servant (who appears again, 19³) *to look toward the sea*; he reports, *There is nothing. And he said: Go again seven times. And it was at the seventh time that he (the servant) said: Behold, there is a little cloud like a man's palm coming up out of the sea*. The OGrr. have expanded the curtness of the story, followed by some modern critics, but without textual reason. *Seven times* means a total of seven times altogether. **44b-46.** Elijah sends word to the king to hasten home before the coming storm to Jezreel, and he himself serves as his outrunner. The instruction to the servant to *go up* to Ahab is geographically difficult; was it a verb of courtesy? **45.** The introductory adverbial phrase, rendered by EVV with 'in a little while,' means *moment by moment (the heavens grew dark)*. For Jezreel and its royal estate see Comm., 21¹. The distance of the drive is variously estimated by Skinner at 17/18 miles, a long chariot-drive indeed at end of the day. **46.** The running of Elijah before the

royal chariot was in truth a gymnastic feat, and is attributed to divine impulse: *the hand of YHWH was upon him* (cf. II. 3¹⁵, Eze. 1³, etc.). It was not impossible for such a son of the desert; it is reported that Arab runners in the desert can cover 100 miles in less than two days (P. W. Harrison, *The Arab at Home*, 1924, p. 2). For the 'girding of the loins,' cf. Dalman, *A. u. S.*, 5, 236 f., and for the 'running at the wheel of one's lord' as a proud duty the 8th-century Aram. inscription of Bar-Rkb. The datum can hardly be fiction, for a later age would not have made Elijah outrunner (cf. 1⁵) of the wicked Ahab. Elijah assumes this office of herald because he had to all appearance won the king and all the people over to the cause of the nation's God—a proud moment, to be followed by bitter disappointment.

ADDITIONAL NOTE TO CH. 18

For the above remarkable story, in addition to literature cited in n. 1 to introduction to cc. 17-19, reference is to be made to L. B. Paton, 'Baal,' etc., *ERE*; R. H. Kennett, *O.T. Essays* (1928), ch. 4, 'Altar Fire'; Alt, 'Das Gottesurteil,' in the G. Beer *Festschrift* (1935), pp. 1 ff.; Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, 1, ch. 5, on 'Magic Control of Weather and Rain'; R. Patai, 'The Control of Rain in Anc. Palestine,' *HUCA* 14 (1939), 251 ff., esp. pp. 254 ff.; Eissfeldt, 'Ba'alšamēm u. Yahwe,' *ZAW* 56 (1939), 1 ff. And finally there is to be listed a monograph by R. de Vaux in the *Bulletin du Musée de Beyrouth*, 5 (1944), 7-20, 'Les prophètes de Baal sur le Mont Carmel.' This gives an admirable study of the Pagan rites presented in the present story with full documentation from all sources. There is to be noted a plate presenting a bas-relief in the Musée des Thermes in Rome, illustrating an orgy of ritual dancing (to cite the author) "qui tourne en dérision une cérémonie isiaque"—a striking parallel indeed to Elijah's sarcasm.

The marvel of the kindling of Elijah's sacrifice has provoked natural discussion. Hitzig (*Gesch. Israels*, 1, 176) suggested the use of nearby naphtha deposits (a geological absurdity); with this suggestion is to be compared the story in 2 Mac. 1^{29ff.}. The annual rekindling of the Holy Fire in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem is a survival of ancient ritual magic. Kennett suggests (pp. 103 ff.) Elijah's use of a naphtha supply and a mirror reflecting the sun's rays, adding that "we need not suppose that Elijah would have been very scrupulous," although he would have "sincerely believed" that such a fire came from heaven. Such rationalizing would preserve the historicity of the story at cost of its morality. Indeed the item of the water-pouring upon the altar contradicts such ritual humbug, doubtless well known in his day. Again an explanation of the lavish water-pouring is

presented by Patai in a fully documented essay on ancient weather-control, rites, etc., e.g., the water-pouring at the Sukkoth feast. Cf. Mowinkel, *Psalmen-Studien* 2 (1922), 100 ff., citing P. Volz, *Das Neujahrsfest Jahwes*, 31, for the suggestion. But this comparison simply makes of Elijah a superstitious parallel to the Baal prophets, while it does not account for what happened. The ritual water-pouring was never applied to altar and sacrifice. The story is naturally told—a stroke of lightning, 'the fire of YHWH' (cf. Gen. 19²⁴, etc.), followed by a great storm, which Elijah anxiously expected. The story—*n.b.* its sequel with Elijah 'running before Ahab' to his palace—is hardly pure invention, as with Meyer (*Sb.*, Berlin, 1930, 76), who regards this narrative, plus 19^{15a}, as a legendary reflection of the story of Elisha's anointing of Jehu and the latter's massacres—a strained explanation indeed! The present writer agrees with F. James, *Personalities of the O.T.*, 174: "Legend has been busy with the story but through its obscurities we can still discern the fact that some test whereby decision was to be made was agreed upon and successfully made." The cause of YHWH as God of Israel triumphed politically over his rival, the Baal of the Heavens.

As for the latter deity the study by Eissfeldt, cited above, with analysis of all the material, Biblical and archæological, offers most welcome illumination. The foreign deity in the story is to be distinguished, as 'the Baal,' from the many local Baals (there were "gods many and lords many," as Paul says, 1 Cor. 8⁶), and is to be identified with the well-known Baal-of-the-Heavens (cf. II. 23⁸). In him was concentrated in Syrian lands the Semitic urge towards monism, if not monotheism.¹ Under Jezebel's fanatical patronage the Heavenly Baal was brought into conflict with Israel's sole Deity; doubtless the practical monotheism of the latter religion intensified the monistic tendency of the religion of 'the Baal.' The result was for the first time in history a fanatical contest in the name of monotheism. Israel could put up with local Baals, as the Church has done with worship of saints; but there can be but one supreme Deity. Jezebel's faction went logically to the root of the matter in attempting to exterminate YHWH's devotees, as did Elijah in the destruction of the Baal's prophets. In formal politics the victory was won by Elijah; the foreign Baal, if not the Baals, was ousted with popular acclaim.

The ancient native Baal prophets have both Biblical and archæological light thrown upon them. The prophesying of those guilds appears in Jer. 2⁸, 23¹³.^{25a}. The earliest known example of such phenomena is noted in the Wen-Amon papyrus (ca. 1100 B.C.), whose author describes a similar occurrence at Byblos, where at a sacrifice

¹ Cf. F. Baethgen, *Der Gott Israels u. die Götter des Heidentums* (1888), esp. pp. 253 ff.; H. Seyrig, 'Le culte de Bêl et de Baalshamin,' *Syria*, 1933, 238 ff.; Montg., 'The Highest, Heaven,' etc., *HTR* 31 (1938), 143 ff. There is also to be noted Albright's discussion in *ARI* 156 f.

performed by the ocal prince to obtain an oracle, "the god seized one of his noble youths, making him frenzied" (Breasted, *ARE* 4, 278 ff., Gressmann, *ATB* 2, 71 ff., Barton, *AB* 449 ff.). For Lucian's day we have his lively description of the prophesying at Syrian Hierapolis (*De Dea Syria*, 36, Garstang's tr.): "These (the oracles) speak not, save by the mouth of priests and prophets; this one is moved by its own impulse, and carries out the divining process to the very end"; the account proceeds with the description of the agitation and sweating of the prophet. We know furthermore from the Aramaic inscription of Zakar king of Hamath (towards 800 B.C.) that the Heavenly Baal had such prophets; Baal-of-the-Heavens was the king's deity, who encouraged him to victory 'through seers [the same word as in Heb.] and prognosticators [lit., calculators]' (col. 1, line 12). Indeed the vigour of such enthusiasts may have stimulated the remarkable expansion of the Israelite Nebi'im of this age.

1. ויהי ימים: for the sing. verb see Note, 11³; 2 MSS deR., ויהי ימים, cf. \mathfrak{C} , and so Then., *al.* (cf. *BH*) would read; Grr., "and it came to pass after many days"; St. would read טקץ ימים; Eissf. sugg. ויהי, connecting with the prev. v., "und er (das Kind) lebte noch lange."—3. עבריהו: cf. עֲבָרָא, and the many such name formations in Phœn. (Harris, *Gram.*, 128 ff.), and in S. Arab. (*NPS* 1, 240 ff.).—4. טאה: Grr. + 'men.'—המשנים: 13 MSS deR., +המשנים, 1 MS Ken., 'בה' = Grr., *κατα πεντηκοντα* = \mathfrak{C} \mathfrak{S} ; the correction appears necessary.—'in the cave-complex,' cf. 19⁹, and see Abel, *GP* 1, 438, n. 1, for similar use of the Arab. sing. in Palestine.—ויכלכם: Burn. well sugg. iterative use of the pf.; most would correct to ויכלכם, in accord with v.¹³.—5. לך: Grr. + *διελθωμεν*; this addition, with Then. *al.*, to be accepted; read with Orlinsky, *JBL* 59 (1940), 515 ff., לכה וינערה.—לכה bis: Grr. om. 1⁰, OGrr. om. 2⁰, Jos. ignores both; but royal orders were extravagantly phrased.—לוא נכרייה טאהמה: for Heb. variants of 'טה' see Ginsb.; the nominal phrase is partitive. The rdgs. in \mathfrak{C} (correct B† *σκαηων το κτηων*) and \mathfrak{S}^L have suggested various emendations, especially in view of the odd use of the Hif. verb, e.g., by Wellh. (*Comp.*, 279), rdg. 'לא תקרה כמנו טהב', followed by many; but St. wisely stands by \mathfrak{H} .—6. הארץ: Grr., \mathfrak{S}^H , 'the road,' an easement.—1⁰ לבנו: \mathfrak{S}^L (and B) om., as though then the king would be unaccompanied, to which St. unjustifiably consents, and so *BH*. The interpolated *μονος* in v.⁷ of OGrr. is actual corrective gloss to v.⁶.—7. ויכרהו: OGrr., κ. *εσπευσεν*, suggesting to Then., *al.* (cf. *BH*) the correction ויבהר; but the translators did not allow the point of 'recognition.'—האתה זה: also v.¹⁷; see BDB 261, GB 193.—10. מטלכה: prob., as distinguished from נוי, in the Phœn. sense of 'royalty' > 'king.'—ואשרו: protasis and apodosis; cf. Dr., *Tenses*, §143. For השביע Grr., *επερησεν*, prob. corruption of *επεπλησεν* = השביע (Klost.).—ימצאנה: potential; cf. Dr., §37, p. 42.—11. הנה אליהו: Gr. texts (B N *al.*) om., \mathfrak{S}^H \times .—

12. "א : masc. as at II. 2¹⁶; see Comm. there.—על אשר : original sense of 'place.'—ולא ימצא : Ⓞ (B N *al.*) om., Ⓜ^H ✕. St. approves the elision, but why?—16. וירך : Grr. pref. "and he ran," accepted by Then., St., *al.*, as=וירץ; but such haste of locomotion was hardly germane to a king.—18. מצות : Grr., 'the Lord your God'; מ' is generally condemned as late, *e.g.*, by St., Šanda, *BH.*—19. ונביאי האשרה וג' : rejected by most critics since Wellh. as gloss; *n.b.* omission of את; Grr., exc. MS *i*, interpolated the clause also in v.²².—20. בני : Grr. om.; some 25 MSS נבול, 4 MSS בני נבול : see deR.—הנביאים : 5 MSS deR. pref. כל=Grr., Ⓜ^H.—21. כל העם : Ⓞ *παντας*, as though for כלתם; but *cf.* v.²⁴.—פסחים על שתי הכעשים : Grr., Ⓜ tr. the verb with 'to go lame,' Ⓜ Ⓜ with 'to be divided.' The same verb, as 'to hop, leap,' appears in v.²⁶ for the ritualistic dance of the Baal prophets, and the Grr. adopt this sense for the foll. words, 'on both *poplites.*' Hence combining these elements Cheyne (*EB* 1000), Benz. interpret the verb here as at v.²⁶, making Elijah refer sarcastically in advance to that rite. But the verb is used in different conjugations, *Ḳal* and *Piel*, in the two vv., and so with distinct mngs. As for the noun, which many still find obscure (*e.g.*, Kit., St.), its root has the sense of 'forking,' as of twigs, and it produced an adj., *sē'ēp*, 'double-, doubtful-minded' (Ps. 119¹¹³), *cf.* *διψυχος* in James 1⁶.—ארו : 2 MSS, Ⓞ om.—22. העם : 16 MSS deR. pref. כל.—23. האחר : 2⁰ : *cf.* the usage in 12²⁹; Grr., 'the other,' and so EVV tr.—ונרתו על העצים : OGrr. om. (Ⓜ^H ✕), which St. approves; but the threefold operation of the two parties is nicely balanced.—24. אלהים : B *al* as pl., but at v.²⁶ as sing.—יהוה : most Grr. + 'my God.'—ויען : MSS ויענו=Grr., exc. Ⓞ^L.—25. הבעל : Grr., τ. *αισχουης*, exc. MS *i*, τ. *Baal.*—26. [אשר] נתן [להם] : read as passive, נתן (so Ⓜ EVV tr.), as St. suggests; interpreted as active, OGrr. omitted as contradicting v.²³.—מבהקר וער הזהרים : Ⓞ^L om.—as exaggerative?—הבעל ענו : Grr. (exc. 44), "hear us, Baal, hear us," modelled after Elijah's prayer, v.³⁷.—ויססו על המזבח : Grr., κ. *διετρεχον επι τ. θυσιαστηριου*; Ⓜ "raved upon . . ."; Ⓜ "laboured at . . ."; Ⓜ "transiliebantque altare," *cf.* Ⓜ Ex. 12¹³, "transibo vos"; the *Piel* is denominative for some ritual custom, a dance, skipping. The prep. is to be understood as 'by, at.'—עשה : Ⓜ; other VSS as pl., EVV as passive; but read עשו with 22 MSS and Sebir (Ginsb.).—27. אלהו : Grr. (exc. 44, 71) + 'the Thesbite'; the same plus in Grr. at v.²⁹.—כי אלהים הוא : Ⓞ^L Ⓞ om., to avoid such a confession; Ⓜ renders the noun with הלא, 'fear.'—שה : the root is used of mental concern, then of study of Scripture (Ps. 119¹⁶, etc.). VSS vary : Grr., *ἀδολοσχία*, 'talk, conversation' (*cf.* II. 9¹¹), and so Aq., *ὁμιλία*=Ⓜ שויעי, 'conversation'; *cf.* Ⓜ 'loquitur,' and similarly Rashi, Kimchi; Ⓜ^H 'business'; Ⓜ 'thought.'—שיג : root identical with שיג, 'to turn aside,' used here euphemistically; Ⓜ 'in diversorio'='in an inn,' or the like; *cf.* Rashi, combining the two verbs as of

'business,' and translating לו ודרר below as of absence 'in a privy' (בית כסא). Klost., Burn., St., BH regard וכי שני as duplicate to כי שיה, and find the Gr. χρηματίζει translating foll. לו ודרר; but the interpretation of Aq., Ⓜ^H with "he is giving a revelation," proves the contrary, as E. Nestle has argued (ZAW 23 [1903], 338 f.), adducing the parallel of χρηματίζειν=שָׁא, Jer. 25³⁰, of ὕψωσις 'thundering.'—כי ודרר לו: represented in Gr. tradition only by gloss from Sym. in Ⓜ^H .—29. The Grr. are most variant from Ⓜ and among themselves in this v. Ⓜ (B al.) exchanges the first two sentences, adds an address to the prophets bidding them to depart, and so "I will make my holocaust," and with note of their departure, then omitting the *finale*, "there was no voice," etc.; Ⓜ^L Hex. (A N) supply κ. ουκ ην φωνη, 5 MSS add κ. ουκ ην ακροασις. The plus was accepted by Then., Grätz; but see Burn., St. at length.—ער לעלות המנהגה: for this combination of preps. see Dr., *Int.*, 538, and Burn., *ad loc.*—30. כל: Grr. om.; cf. v.²².—וירפא את מונח: OGrr. transfer to after first sentence in v.³².—31. יעקב: 8 MSS deR., ישראל=A Ⓜ^H .—32. ויבנה: for the uncontracted form see Note, 10²⁹.—בשם: Ⓜ^L om., Ⓜ^H ✕, unnecessarily deleted by St.—תעלה: Grr., θαλασσαν (=Ⓜ^H), exc. Ⓜ^L , θαλαα, and so respectively at v.³⁶; the latter is the original OGr., with Rahlfs, SS 3, 285; later scribes turned it into θάλασσα, with reminiscence of the 'sea' in the temple; Lucifer correctly, 'foveam.'—33. העצים: OGrr.+ "upon the altar that he made"—superfluous!—על העצים: Ⓜ Ⓜ om.; then OGrr., Ⓜ contain an addition.—34. ארבעה: Ⓜ^L 'two.'—ועל העצים: Ⓜ + "and they did so," which St., Šanda, BH regard as original—again unnecessary.—35. מלא: orig. Ⓜ ἐπλησεν, largely corrupted to the pl. (B A al.).—36. ויהי בעלות המנהגה: OGrr. om., as contradicting the time given above, v.²⁹, or because there was no regular *minhāh* on Carmel?—המנהגה: A το υδωρ, error for τ. δωρου.—ויגש אליהו הנביא: Grr., Ⓜ^H have replaced with "and E. called to heaven"; the Heb. verb is used in ritualistic sense, and the Grr. may have avoided the notion that E. was serving as priest. יו MS and Grr. om. 'the prophet,' which is not used elsewhere as title of Elijah, although he was 'a prophet,' v.²².—In the Grr. v.³⁶ has been contaminated from v.³⁷.—ובנברוך: many MSS, Kr. correctly the sing.=VSS; cf. Note, 3¹².—כל: 2 MSS, Grr. (exc. Ⓜ^L), Ⓜ^H om.—37. Ⓜ^L om. v.³ to avoid duplication of v.³⁶.—הכבת: for the divine *sibbah* see 12¹⁵.—אחריות: Ⓜ^L σπισω σου, an exegetical aid.—38. "the stones and the dust": OGrr. transfer to end of the v.; the original may have been a gloss entered at different places (St.).—39. וירא: OGrr., "and fell all the people"= Ⓜ^H ; 'seeing' of the marvel omitted for religious reasons?—so St.—ויאמרו: Grr.+ 'Amen,' with reminiscence of Neh. 8⁶, a parallel incident.—40. להם: Grr., Ⓜ^H =לעם: cf. v.²¹.—41. הטון: Grr., πῶδων; Ⓜ Ⓜ correctly 'noise,' and so comm.; cf. Poole, AV^{ms}; modern trr. generally follow Ⓜ , 'sonus multæ pluvizæ.'—42. ראש: A (=Ⓜ^H)

alone of the Grr. renders ; Jos. has ; it was omitted on the ground that the servant 'went up,' *i.e.*, to the top.—ויגור: the verb, also at II. 4³⁴. 35, is unique ; see Note on latter passage.—43. *Ad fin.* OGrr. + "and the servant returned seven times" ; to this B pref. "turn back seven times, and return seven times," and 6^L replaces the second command with "and look seven times" —these variations significant of the easy handling of this ch. by the Grr.—44. עלה טים : B A N v αναγουσα υδωρ (=6^H), reading the verb as active and the noun-complex as טים ; *al.* + απο θαλασσης = 6^E 1 ; the doublet is thus ancient.—עלה אחר אל איהב- ; for Lagarde's mistaken Lucianic text here see Rahlfs, SS 3, 27.—אמר : VSS, modern trr. naturally add 'thy chariot.'—45. ער כה וער כה : 6^T paraphrases, "while he was harnessing" ; 6^Y "cumque se verteret huc atque illuc."—וירכב- : Grr., κ. εκλαιεν (B† κ. εκλαεν) = 6^H, apparently misreading as though ויכך, then assuming Elijah as subject, and transposing 'Ahab' as subj. of the foll. verb.—46. היתה : B† 6^E om.—[אליהו] אל : read על ; *cf.* II. 3¹⁵.—יוריעאה : the Grr. have many variants for the place-name ; B *al.*, Ισραηλ, and so regularly below (*cf.* 21¹), the form reduced from Ιεσδραηλ ; *cf.* MS u, Ιεσδραελ : 6^L correctly Ιεζραηλ ; A Ιεζαβελ (!).

19¹⁻¹⁸. Elijah's flight and despair ; the divine revelation on Horeb, and fresh commissions. Elijah has celebrated his God's triumph, but now Jezebel takes her revenge. **1. 2.** The statement that *Ahab told Jezebel all that Elijah had done*, etc., is an intimate touch. The queen, woman-like, acts imperiously, sending a message to Elijah that she has put herself under oath to make his *life like the life of one of those prophets*, and so she has sworn by *Gods*. For the intensity of such an oath see Comm. 18⁸⁻¹⁵. **3.** And Elijah *was afraid* [so with MSS, Grr., 6^Y ; 6^H saw], and he fled to *Beer-sheba of Judah* on the southern border of the Sown, merely a stage in his flight, for he was going into No Man's Land. Having left his servant behind (**4**) *he went a day's journey in the steppe. And he came and sat down under a juniper tree* : so EVV after 6^Y ; the plant is a broom-tree (so JV), *genista rætam*. *Cf.* Robinson's comment in his diary at Beer-sheba : "Elijah sat down under a shrub of Retem, just as our Arabs sat down under it every day and night" (*BR* 1, 302). And he prayed for death, the common lot of all. **5.** There *he lay down and slept* 'under a juniper-tree' [see Note]. *And lo, one* (om. *an angel*, with Grr.) *touching him*, and he heard the bidding, *Arise and eat*. **6.** *He looked*, and saw a miraculously prepared breakfast ; *cf.* the miraculous feedings in ch. 17. **7.** He fell

asleep again, to be wakened by the now recognizable *Angel of YHWH* (the antique phrase for the apparition of Deity, peculiar to J in the Pentateuch), summoning him to eat again, *because the journey is too much for thee*. **8.** *And so in the strength of that food he went for forty days and forty nights to the Mount of God, Horeb.* Šanda calculates this distance *via* Akaba as about 480 km., and so the daily travel at 12 km.; rather, with Kittel, the item is proof how little the Northern narrator knew of that territory. Horeb is predominantly the name for the mount of revelation in the Pentateuchal sources E (Northern) and D (*cf.* 8⁹), but Sinai in J and P; in the Northern Song of Deborah the revelation occurred in Seir-Edom (Jud. 5⁴; 'That is Sinai,' v.⁵ is a gloss); and in the Blessing of Moses (Dt. 33) Sinai-Seir-Paran is the location. Accordingly the northern traditions vary. This objective of Elijah is the same as that in the history of Moses (Ex. 3¹), with here also a corresponding theophany. **9a.** The lodging in a *cave* is another correspondent, *i.e.*, with 'the hole in the rock,' out of which Moses saw 'the back' of YHWH (Ex. 33^{21ff.}); but there is no verbal identity between the two descriptions. **9b-11a,** *And the word of YHWH came to him, and said to him: What doest thou here, Elijah?* There follows Elijah's despairing response, as again in v.¹⁴, and then the divine command: *And he said: Go forth, and stand in the mount before YHWH.* V.^{11a} contradicts v.¹³, and all that preceded, from v.^{9b} and on, is duplicate, to vv.^{13, 14}. Hence modern critics in general (*e.g.*, Wellhausen, *Comp.*, 230, Stade, Benzinger, Šanda, Skinner) rightly agree that the whole passage is secondary. The command, "to stand in the mount before YHWH" may have been modelled after the Mosaic tradition (Ex. 19²⁰, etc.), and the mysterious scene presented below is summed up here in the more commonplace statement that *the word of YHWH came to him*. **11b-13.** *And lo! YHWH was passing by. And a great wind and strong, rending mountains and breaking rocks before [in the presence of, or, in advance of?] YHWH: YHWH was not in the wind. And after the wind an earthquake: YHWH was not in the earthquake. And after the earthquake a fire: YHWH was not in the fire.* Contrast the fiery phenomena which otherwise attended Elijah's career (18³⁸, II. 1^{10ff.}, 2¹¹). *And after the fire a sound*

[Heb. *voice*] of a *light whisper*. So with Burney's excellent rendering, although the translation of AV, *a still small voice*, remains classical. Contrast of this saying of enduring religious import with the materials of other theophanies (e.g., Ex. 19^{18ff.}) is naturally pressed by commentators; but it is to be borne in mind that in such physical manifestations there is generally the subtle distinction between 'the Face,' 'Glory,' 'Name,' 'Word,' of the Deity, and his *persona propria*. The marvel is that here in a legend about an early Northern man of God the spiritual nature of God and of his self-revelation to man is for the first time expressed in historical narrative. V.¹³ is of equally delicate character: *When Elijah heard, he wrapped his face in his mantle, and he went out and stood in the opening of the cave*. A striking historical parallel to this scene is the call of Mohammad, who received his first visions in a cave in the mountain of Hira, and who enveloped himself in his cloak upon the revelation; see Surah, 73, 1; 74, 1, and W. Muir, *Life of Mohammad*, vol. 1 (rev. ed., 1923), 49 f. Cf. K. Ahrens, *Muhammed als Religionsstifter* (1935), 36 f., e.g., "das Einwickeln gehörte also offenbar auch zu den Gebräuchen der altarabischen Mantik." The zephyr-like whisper fascinated the prophet, who was terrified by the earlier stupendous phenomena. The inquiry by articulate voice: *What doest thou here, Elijah?*, is personal, rebuking his faintheartedness; life is worth living, for there is more for him to do elsewhere than in the Mount of God. The primitive divine is rebuked even as was the great Jeremiah: "If thou hast run with footmen, and they have wearied thee, then how canst thou contend with horses?" (Jer. 12⁵). A great mission first discovers the man's soul. 14. Elijah obstinately makes his complaint: *I have been most zealous for YHWH, God of Hosts; for the Bnê-Israel have forsaken thee [with Grr.; \mathfrak{H} thy covenant; see Note, v.¹⁰], thrown down thy altars, and slain thy prophets with the sword; and I, even I only, am left; and they seek my life to take it away*. With this plaint YHWH is not concerned; he has other errands for him.

VV.¹⁵⁻¹⁸. This sequel remains a standing puzzle. Elijah did not anoint Hazael and Jehu; it was Elisha whose second sight, when he was in Damascus, suggested to Hazael the murder of his predecessor (II. 8^{7ff.}), and who indirectly

anointed Jehu (9^{1st}). The alleged commission to Elijah appears to be a case of transfer from the Elisha legend. In Jewish tradition Elijah is the one perfect man, to whom forsooth all credit should be given. Sanda has attempted a rewriting of the vv. to this effect, but he recognizes that it may be a 'venturesome' attempt. Many scholars (most recently Eissfeldt, pp. 328 f.) would find a lacuna between vv.^{18, 19}. The initial command, *Go, return on thy way to the steppe of Damascus* (a unique geographical designation), is balanced by Elisha's visit to that city (II. 8^{7th}); is there indirect implication that Elijah there anointed Hazael in anticipation of Elisha's second sight? The climactic, *him that escapeth from Hazael's sword shall Jehu slay, and him that escapeth from Jehu's sword shall Elisha slay* (v.¹⁷) appears incongruous in the connexion. With avoidance of this long complicated passage v.¹⁹ makes proper connexion with the commands, *Go, return on thy way* (v.¹⁵), and *anoint Elisha . . . to be prophet in thy room*. **18.** *Yet will I leave seven thousand in Israel, all the knees that have not bowed unto the Baal, and every mouth that hath not kissed him.* The figure for the remnant may be an authentic note of some census taken of the Zealots. The kissing of the Baal may refer to the wafted kiss of the hand, so certainly at Job 31^{26^r}, for Classical references to which ritual see Poole; or to actual osculation of the image or symbol, cf. those 'kissing calves' Hos. 13². The obligatory kissing of the Stone in the Ka'bah at Mecca preserves this ancient Semitic rite.

VV.¹⁹⁻²¹. The call of Elisha. **19.** *And he went thence (for the indefinite reference see above) and came upon Elisha ben Shaphat; and he was plowing with twelve yoke of oxen in front of him, and he with the twelfth.* Elisha evidently belonged to a family of competence, with twelve teams of oxen and drivers to assist him in the ploughing. For the scene see H. Guthe, *MNDPV* 1905, pt. I, 57, continuing earlier discussion, to the effect that the teams of oxen were attached to as many separate ploughs, and that fields of such capacity were quite possible; in some operations a row when ploughed and seeded is at once filled in by another plough working alongside; he himself had seen seven ploughs so working in a field. Cf. the five yoke of oxen, Luke 14¹⁹. For illustration of the Babylonian

and Egyptian ploughs see Benzinger, *Arch.*, 143. Elijah does not anoint Elisha, as expected from v.¹⁶, but consecrates him by *casting his mantle upon him*. Eissfeldt (p. 329) finds no contradiction here with the earlier command, which was used 'im übertragenen Sinne.' The particular word here for mantle (also above, v.¹³) etymologically and generally means a robe of state (e.g., for a king, Jon. 3⁶), and is used of the official dress of prophets, so again of Elijah's mantle in II. 2, as also that of deceiving prophets (Zec. 13⁴). According to II. 1⁸ this mantle was made of hair. Investiture with sacred garments still remains part of the ordination ritual in the Church. But the present story parallels, indeed conflicts with II. 2, which tells of Elijah's parting legacy to Elisha. 20. Elisha realized a commission that would separate him from his parents, and asked that he might *kiss* them in farewell. Elijah's response, *Go back (again)* [EVV], *for what have I done to thee?*, has puzzled comm. Šanda devotes nearly a page to the v. But the inquiry is simplest taken as an expression of mystery, exposition of which is reserved for the future; on his part Elisha is moved to recognize the call, the inspiration coming from the investiture. 21. The sacrificial meal on the two oxen, boiled in antique fashion on the spot, partaken of by *the people*, the assembled neighbours, is paralleled by similar extemporized sacrifices, e.g., 1 Sam. 6¹⁴, 2 Sam. 24^{22ff.}. After this ceremony Elisha *arose and went after Elijah, and ministered to him*. According to 18^{43f.} Elijah had a 'boy'; but Elisha's personal service was part of his discipline in his new vocation. Elisha does not appear again until II. 2¹, when he and his chief are at Gilgal. Likewise Moses had his 'minister,' Joshua (Ex. 24¹³). It may be said that this story casts authentic light upon the order of prophets.

1. ואת כל אשר : 1 MS om.; Grr., \mathfrak{S}^H ignore את כל, an emendation generally accepted; but the phrase=Engl. 'all how'; cf. את אשר, 8³¹, II. 8¹²= 'how'; see Ew., *Syntax*, §333.— כל 3⁰: 4 MSS Ken. deR. om.=OGrr.; St., BH delete, but omission may have been due to indefinite sense of 'the prophets,' to which 2 Gr. MSS add 'of Baal'=C.—2. מלאך : OGrr. om., Jos. 'messengers'; it is not necessary (St.).—לאשר : Grr. (cf. \mathfrak{S}^H) +εἰ σὺ εἰ Ηλείου καὶ ἐγὼ (\mathfrak{S}^L +εἰμι) Ἰεζεβελελ, i.e., אתה אלהו ואני איובל, the addition accepted by Then., Klost. (with further willful amendment), Burn., Gunkel, and by BH as probable; but St.'s caution is to be noted:

“ it is difficult to understand how it could have been omitted in 𐤁.” However it is a fine and unique psychological note.—יעשון : 24 MSS deR. + לִי = VSS (cf. 2²³) ; the same variation in MSS and VSS in 1 Sam. 14⁴⁴ ; the plus generally accepted since Then. (BH as ‘ probable ’) ; but note St.’s remark that it is inconceivable that early copyists should have omitted the reference to Jezebel herself.—יוספון : יעשון, cf. the variant in 20¹⁰. The pl., with the subj. ‘ gods ’ appears in all VSS exc. Gr. B, C 𐤁 ; it is to the point here in the pagan’s mouth, despite St. The pl. is indeed used with monotheistic אלהים (GK §145, i).—3. וְיָרָא : 6 MSS deR., ויירא, and others with 𐤀. וְיָרָא = Grr., 𐤁 𐤁 𐤁 and a MS of C, a correction to be accepted.—[נפשו] : אל : MSS^{or} על (Ginsb.), and so in the same phrase, Gen. 19¹⁷.—אשר ליהורה : for the Gr. texts see Rahlfs, SS 3, 243.—4. רָחַם : Grr., 𐤁 offer vocalization as in Arab. *vatum*.—ארת : 𐤀, also MSS, ארת, as in v.⁵, where *vice versa* MSS have ארת ; the variation of genders is a case of ‘ double reading ’ ; for many instances of similar variation see Féghali, *Du genre grammatical*, 66 ff.—נפשי : Grr. + ‘ from me ’ = 1 MS מני.—5. תרת רחם אחר : evidently a gloss ; the Gr., ‘ there under a bush,’ is secondary, as the variant translation of the noun shows (Šanda).—מלאך : Grr. (not Aq., Sym.) om., expressing the subj. with τῆς ; the mystery is heightened by the indefinite ‘ one touching ’ ; in v.⁷ Elijah recognizes who the subject was. St. takes a contrary view here.—6. מראשתיו : locative, as elsewhere ; for form see BL, Index, s.v.—צפחת : ענת, the words at 17^{12, 13}.—רצפים : heated stones for cooking ; the word also at Is. 6⁶ ; Grr. *δλυπελτης* (*δλυρα*, a kind of grain) = 𐤁 𐤁 ; C 𐤁 מעפא, ‘ a rolled-up cake ’ ; 𐤁 ‘ panis.’—8. ויקם = Grr., but 𐤁 𐤁. הר האלהים הרב : OGrr. om. the second noun, which St. regards as secondary ; but the Grr. also om. the word in the same phrase at Ex. 3¹—for Sion was the Mount of God !—המערה : for the definite noun cf. 18⁴.—9. לו : 4 MSS Ken. om. = OGrr. ; cf. v.¹³, where however 6 MSS add לו to ויאמר.—10. עובו בריהו : Grr., 𐤁 as עובו, which must be original ; the same correction to be made in v.¹⁴ with the Grr., although there the secondary duplicate ‘ thy covenant ’ has entered into many texts (B al.) ; cf. intrusion of מצות in 18¹⁸.—VV.^{10, 14, 18} are cited in Rom. 11^{3, 4} ; see Int., §11, c.—11. צא : Grr. + ‘ tomorrow,’ the addition due to the Gr. tr. of the foll. ppls. as future verbs, and reminiscent of Ex. 34².—רוח גדולה וזוק : for economy’s sake the second adj. lapses into the masc. ; for similar cases see GK §132, d, Burn. ; there is no reason, with St., to fault the clause. For the masc. of originally fem. רוח see Note, 22²¹.—12. קול דממה : Grr., *φωνη αυρας λεπτης* ; 𐤁 ‘ sibilus auræ tenuis.’ Cf. Job 4¹⁶ רממה וקול ; in Ps. 107²⁹ ‘ר = ‘ breeze.’ In the Talmud רמם (also רום) is used of whispering, particularly evil whispering ; see G. V. Schick, *The Stems Dum and Damam in Hebrew* (Johns Hopkins Univ. Thesis, Lpzg., 1913). T. H. Robinson accepts the variant mng. of the root, and translates the passage with “ after

the fire, hark! a fine silence" (*HI* 306, n. 1).—**13.** פתח: locative; Ⓢ *υπο*, rdg. תחת=Hex.; Ⓢ^L improves with prep. *para*.—**14.** עינו בריח: see above, v. 10.—**15.** כן־כָּרָה רמשק: for like pointing in construct relation *cf.* a case in *Josh.* 18¹² (*Ginsb.*), and see *Ew., Lehrb.*, §216, b. 'Desert of Damascus' is an odd enough phrase; may it be translated with 'by the desert to Damascus'?—'the desert' being used of Transjordan, as at *Mt.* 15³³. Ⓢ has "and come to the desert of D., and come and anoint," which has suggested that 'desert of D.' is secondary, with duplication of 'come'; hence *St.* elides; Šanda suggests that each of the words is a gloss, the first to ליריבך, the second to באת. But rewriting is fairly impossible.—הוא: for the name see *Note*, II. 8⁹.—**16.** יהו: see *Note*, II. 9².—נשי: נשי on a Samaritan ostracon (*IAE* 47).—אלישע: the name on a Samaritan ostracon and seal (*ib.*, 200).—מאבל מוולה: B† inserts after *χρῖσεις*; for the place see *Comm.* 4¹².—**18.** והשארתי: Ⓢ^L κ. καταλειψω; MS *i*, κ. καταλειπον=Rom. 11⁴; *al.*, κ. καταλειψεις=Ⓢ^H (as though ק, BH as 'possibly correct').—ברעו: *Grr.*, *ακλασαν* ('bent'), exc. Ⓢ^L *εκαμψαν*=Rom.—לבעל: B *al.*, τω B., Ⓢ^L τη B. (but *αυτον* below)=Rom.—נשק לו: *Grr.*, Ⓢ^H, "worshipped him," Ⓢ "adored him, kissing the hand."—**19.** הרש: *Grr.*+ 'with oxen,' explicitly.—בשנים העשר: for cardinal in place of lacking ordinal see *GK* §134, o. אליהו: Gr. MSS om. by haplog. with *him*, similarly 2 *Heb.* MSS om. אליו.—אליו 1⁰: " (crossed over) to him," and so it can be understood with *Kit.*, Šanda; *St.* demands עליו " (passed) by him," which would express well the rapidity of the scene.—אליו 2⁰; read עליו with 6 MSS *Ken.*—**20.** אָשָׁקָה BH, אָשָׁקָה, Bār, *Ginsb.*: see Bār's note and *GK* §10, h. ולאמי: B A *al.*, Ⓢ om., Ⓢ^H ✕; *St.* arbitrarily elides; *Jos.* for the phrase, "take leave of his parents," evading the delicate sentiment.—ך שוב: 1 MS om. לך, and so *OGrr.* texts, Ⓢ; 1 MS om. שוב; the omissions show early perplexity. The form expected is לך שוב; but the simple explanation is to understand the *impvs.* separately: "Go! Turn back!" *Benz.*, followed by *Haupt*, interprets with "Go (and then) come back"; but this ignores the following repellent query.—כי כה: Ⓢ Ⓢ^H *σσι*=Ⓢ^H; Ⓢ^L *τι*; these by abbreviation of original *σσι τι*.—**21.** ויזבהו: for the use of the verb for profane slaughtering see *GB s.v.* הנשר: *Grr.*, Ⓢ^H om.; a gloss to define the acc. pl. in *בשלם*, the sing. expected after *זבהו*; *Rashi*, *Kimchi* discuss the phrase; *cf.* *EVV.*

Ch. 20. Two successful, divinely supported enterprises of Ahab against Aram, and the ominous sequel of the second. *Cf. Ant.*, viii, 14. This chapter with its sequel in 22¹⁻³⁸ stands singularly alone in style and novelty of contents; it is written, as *Skinner* remarks, "from a political rather than a religious standpoint, and exhibiting the character and policy of Ahab in a much more favourable light than is the case in ch.

xvii-xix or xxi." Robinson assumes as the source of the cc. an original 'Acts of Ahab' (*Int.*, 97 f.). The stories are told in most graphic, almost journalistic style, and their data appear to be closely contemporaneous. In three sections, vv.¹³⁻¹⁵, 22, v.²⁸, vv.³⁵⁻⁴³, a 'prophet' or 'man of God' appears. These are adjudged to be intrusions by many critics; however those prophets are stoutly nationalistic, not anti-régime, like Elijah, Micaiah (ch. 22). For criticism reference may be made to Wellhausen, *Comp.*, 282 f., Kittel, pp. 162 ff. (with notation of linguistic and phraseological peculiarities, pp. 163, 170), Eissfeldt, *Einkl.*, 329 f. The two stories, ignoring Elijah and Elisha, bear witness to a wealth of contemporary saga. The Greek translators reversed the order of cc. 20 and 21 (the Hexapla restoring the Hebrew order), and this change has been accepted by many critics, e.g., Benzinger, Kittel, Sanda, Landersdorfer (not by Stade, Eissfeldt). But all presumption is against Greek rearrangements in general. In either case the end of Ahab (ch. 22) is prefaced by a prophetic doom (20^{35ff.}, 21^{17ff.}), and the former with its personal reference, 'thy life for his life,' may have appeared to the translators as the more appropriate introduction to the final tragedy.

Historically cc. 20 and 22 introduce us at length to the constant wars waged in the middle of the ninth century between Israel, under the capable Omrid dynasty, and Damascus. The king of the latter state was Ben-Hadad I; see below on v.³⁴. But the two enemies came to join forces against the arch-enemy Assyria. In 853 B.C. occurred the famous battle of Karkar, at which 'Ahab the Israelite' was arrayed with Damascus and nine other Syrian states, with their kings named, against Shalmaneser III of Assyria.¹ The chronological relation of this chapter to that date is uncertain. Ahab was fighting Damascus subsequently (ch. 22), losing his life ca. 852. For the end of Ben-Hadad and the accession of Hazael see II. 8^{7ff.}. Altogether the chapter presents a vivid picture of the involved and interminable struggles among the

¹ See his Monolith inscr.: *KB* I, 173; *CP* 296; *ARA* I, §§610 f.; *ATB* I, 341; *AB* 458. As Rogers notes, the allied forces consisted of 3940 chariots, 1900 horsemen, 1000 camels, 62,900 infantry; Ahab's contingent being 2000 chariots, 10,000 infantry; it is to be noted that the latter is assigned no cavalry.

Syrian and neighbouring states, a replica of which is given by the somewhat later inscription of Zakar king of La'ash and Hamath (see Comm. on II. 13^{24, 25}).²

VV.¹⁻¹². The siege of Samaria. 1. *And Ben-Hadad king of Aram, having collected all his army, and thirty-two kings with him, and horse and chariotry, went up, and besieged Samaria, and assaulted it.* Stade has attempted revision of the v. on basis of OGr., finding, *inter al.*, the item of the *thirty-two kings* absurd, which figure, it has been suggested, was borrowed from 'the thirty-two charioteers' of 22³¹; that figure however is probably secondary, failing in the parallel text of Ch. But the figure has interesting support in a broken inscription from Zenjirli in North Syria with a reference to 'thirty kings' (Lidzb., *HNE* 444). In addition to the figures for the Syrian states noted above (*cf.* note 2), at a later age Esarhaddon counts twenty-two 'Hittite (*i.e.*, Aramæan) kings,' and Ashurbanipal, 'twenty-two kings of the sea-coast' (*ARA* 2, §§771, 876). For the period of a thousand years earlier Dossin has collected the names of 32 cities and their kings with whom Zimri-ilim of Mari was in friendly correspondence (*Syria*, 1939, 109). *He assaulted it*: in technical contrast to mere investment; *cf.* 1 Sam. 23¹, Is. 7¹. VV.²⁻⁶. The successive demands of the Aramæan king upon Ahab provoked inquiry since Wellhausen's correction in v.³, acc. to which Ben-Hadad's terms were: *thy silver and gold are mine, but thy wives and thy goodliest children remain thine* (reading *lk* for *ly*), and then, after Ahab's diplomatic reply, *Milord the king, I and all mine are thine*, Ben-Hadad followed up his first demand with that for *thy wives and children*. To this new outrageous demand Ahab would have objected before his councillors (v.⁷), his statement being expressed by the Grr. with slight but radical change from *℔*, as follows: "He has (now)

² For the political picture of Syrian politics presented in this and the following histories see Alt's monograph on 'Die syrische Staatenwelt vor dem Einbruch der Assyrer,' in particular pp. 245 ff., from which may be cited his observation: "Hingegen wird kaum zu bezweifeln sein, dass der Erzähler die Verhältnisse seiner Zeit richtig wiedergibt, wenn er das Aramäerreich als ein aus vielen Herrschaften zusammengesetztes Gebilde darstellt." Also for the contemporary Syrian history see E. Kraeling, *Aram and Israel*, cc. 9 ff.; Olmstead, *HPS* cc. 25, 26; Meyer, *GA* 2, 2, sect. viii.

sent to me for my wives and children, (while) my silver and gold I did not (earlier) withhold from him." The corrections of text in vv.^{3, 7} have been accepted by some comm., e.g., Kittel, Stade. But without correction of the text a valid contrast appears between the two demands in **¶**, as between the surrender of royal possessions and the fresh demand (v.⁶) to *search thy household and thy ministers' households* and to take away *everything delightful in thy eyes* (not 'in their eyes,' with Grr., and so most comm.—the terms are expressed with malice). Such a search would have involved not only the pillage but also possession of the city; and so Benzinger, Šanda, Eissfeldt hold, while Skinner is undecided between the two views; the latter well remarks that such confusion as there may be is original, the narrator reporting 'at second hand.' The parallel to Ahab's acquiescence to the first requisition exists in Hezekiah's capitulation, not surrender, to Sennacherib, with heavy ransom, the tribute including even Hezekiah's 'daughters, the women of his palace' (see Comm. II. 18^{15b}). In v.⁷ OGrr. add 'and my daughters' to 'my sons,' suggesting to some the introduction of this item also in v.³; but **¶**^L, Jos. properly translate the Heb. 'sons' with 'children.' **7. 8.** Ahab takes counsel with *all the elders of the land*, and then *all the elders and all the people* frame refusal of the arrogant summons. OGrr. omit 'of the land' in the first case, and the correction is accepted by some (e.g., Kittel, Stade, BH), but it is a legal expression; cf. the local 'elders of the city,' 21⁸. 'Elders and people' corresponds exactly to Roman 'senatus populusque'; see at length Comm., II. 11^{14b}. Josephus has a fine sense of the matter: συναγάγων εἰς ἐκκλησίαν τὸ πλῆθος. **10.** Ben-Hadad's preposterous boast, with an oath identical with Jezebel's (19²), has been variously interpreted. **¶** and Hex. read Heb. 'for handfuls,' by different vocalization, as 'for foxes,' with the result, not enough earth left for foxes to burrow in (accepted by Klostermann). Josephus thinks of raising a mound against the city by innumerable handfuls. But the phrase simply means that the Syrian host can carry away the whole city by handfuls (so Grotius, *al.*). For a similar 'audax hyperbole' (Poole) cf. Hushai's talk of pulling any resistant city into the wady below by ropes (2 Sam. 17¹³). **11.** Ahab's

brave answer in four Hebrew words: *The girder-on boast not like the unloosener!*, was probably proverbial; for the two verbs cf. 1 Sam. 17³⁹, Is. 45¹, etc. **12.** The envoys found Ben-Hadad *and the kings in the booths drinking*, carousing in anticipation of victory in the shacks erected for the royal party. The king gives orders for the assault with a single technical verb corresponding to English 'to set on,' which may best be expressed with *Attack!* (and so 1 Sam. 15², Eze. 23²⁴—EVV 'set yourselves in array'). *And they attacked the city.*

VV.¹³⁻²¹. The surprise attack by Israel and the rout of the Syrians. The narrative is critically complicated by the introduction of *a certain prophet* (v.¹³), reappearing in v.²², and apparently as *the man of God* (v.²⁸), while yet another anonymous prophet appears in v.³⁵, 'some one of the sons of the prophets.' Cf. by contrast the naming of otherwise unknown prophets in 22^{8ff.}, Micaiah and Sedekiah. Josephus indeed identifies our prophet here with the former. It is easy to detach these sections as mere Sagas of the Prophets. But in the present case the prophet's word directing attack *by the squires of the commandants of the provinces* is so entangled in the narrative that it is difficult to draw the line between the strata. Stade omits the incident of the prophet, vv.¹³⁻¹⁵, and the subsequent references to 'the squires,' vv.¹⁷⁻¹⁹, but thus avoids the evident scheme of the story, a surprise by a shock-force, when Ben-Hadad was drinking himself drunk with his allied princes, whereupon came the ensuing rout inflicted by the army of Israel headed by the king. The prophetic story may be expansion of an original narrative in which the decision to send out the flying force of the squires was determined upon. Stade further reduces vv.^{15ff.} to a minimum of text. Kittel, retaining the references to the squires, preserves most of the narrative, along with excisions and transpositions (following van Doorninck, *Theol. Tijdschrift*, 1895, 576 ff.), e.g., transposing vv.²⁰⁻²¹. Šanda without further mutilation of the text obtains the most reasonable rearrangement by the sequence vv.^{19-20a-21-20b}. Following this order, with slight change, the story from v.¹⁶ and on may be reconstructed as follows. **16a.** *And they went out at noon, i.e.*, the squires, the army following them subsequently; the great midday carousal of the enemy gave opportunity for this sally. **16b.** The passage

is doublet of v.^{12a}. **17a.** *And the squires, etc., went out first.* VV.^{17b}. **18** tell of the report to Ben-Hadad and his orders for capturing the small band. **19a.** *And these went out of the city,* with the exegetical addition, *the squires*, **19b.** *and the army which was after them :* to be elided with Kittel. **20a.** *And they slew every one his man.* **21.** *And the king of Israel went out (i.e., with the army), and smote the horse and chariotry, smiting the Aramæans with great slaughter [lit., smiting].* **20b.** *And the Aramæans fled, and Israel pursued them.* But the written story may have been confused *ab origine*. The following details are to be noted. V.¹⁴. In reply to the promise of deliverance the realistic king asks, *By whom ?*, to which inquiry there is the prompt answer : *By the squires of the commandants of the provinces.* The first noun (Heb. primarily *youths*, EVV *young men*) is a technical military term, like the correspondent Arab. *gûlam*, employed in the Arabic chronicles of the Crusades for the young knights ; *cf.* the parallel in Sanskrit *marya* (Albright, *OLz.*, 1931, 220). Such a squire of king Jehoiachin now appears by name on a stamp (see Comm., II. 24⁸). The next nominal phrase occurs also in Est. 1³ ; these officers are military, another term being used for Solomon's administrators (4^{7ff.}). The word for *provinces* is of Aramaic origin, occurring elsewhere only in post-Exilic literature, with primary meaning of a judicial district ; we obtain here a glimpse of the government of the Israelite state, with which *cf.* Solomon's districting. The Bnê-Israel numbered 7000, for which figure *cf.* note 1 above. *And Ben-Hadad . . . escaped on a horse with horsemen :* so EVV ; but *ח* . . . *and horsemen.* The phrase is complicated by the doubt whether the last noun means 'horsemen' or 'horses,' and no satisfactory interpretation has been reached here ; see Comm., 1⁵, and Note below. **22.** *At the return (cycle) of the year : i.e., of the military year, the spring equinox, defined in 2 Sam. 11¹ with " at the time when kings go out to battle."*

VV.²³⁻³⁴. The campaign of the Syrians in the following year ; their defeat at Aphek ; Ben-Hadad's flight into the fortress ; his surrender and the Israelite king's gallant treatment of him. **23.** *Mountain gods are their gods :* so correctly GV FV AV, *vs.* RVV JV, " their god is a god of the hills." The polytheistic expression has true colour, even as it is put into the mouth of

the Philistines (1 Sam. 4⁸), of Goliath (*ib.* 17⁴³), of Jezebel (19²). An Akkadian epithet of Syrian Adad is 'mountain god' (*bêl šadî*, see Langdon, *Semitic*, vol. 5 of *Mythology of all Races*, 39): *cf.* Baal of Hermon, Jud. 3³, Baal of Lebanon, in a Phœnician inscription (CIS I, 5). Poole cites a number of references to this distinction of certain deities, *e.g.*, of Pan as 'mountain-walker.' **24.** For this extraordinary attempt at centralization of the Damascene state with the reduction of kings to mere governors (for the imported Akkadian word see 10¹⁵) see Alt, cited above, n. 2. **26.** For the moot question of the location of Aphek see Note. **28.** The v. is a duplicate of v.²³, with as subject *the man of God*, in place of 'a prophet'; the phrase may be indefinite, 'the man of God in question.' **29.** *The Bnê-Israel smote* [EVV *slew*] *Aram*, 100,000 *footmen*. The figure is absurd, whether referring to slaughter or defeat (the same verb is used in both mngs. in vv.³⁵.³⁶), and is doubtless an exaggeration. **30.** Like judgment is to be passed upon the statement concerning the 27,000 *men*, upon whom *the (city) wall fell*; Šanda would support the item, comparing Sennacherib's use of mining machines. Stade well recovers the original wording of the v.: *And the rest fled to Aphek. And Ben-Hadad fled, and came into the citadel* [EVV *city*], (*fleeing*) *by chamber after chamber* (*cf.* 22²⁵, II. 9²), *i.e.*, the vaults of the fortress. **31. 32.** The counsel and action of surrender are vividly presented. *Ropes on our heads*: more exactly with Josephus, *about our heads*, which, he notes, was 'the ancient manner of supplication among the Syrians.' The suppliant phrase, *thy servant Ben-Hadad*, is countered with knightly courtesy by the Israelite king: *Is he still alive? He is my brother!* The latter title is used mutually by the kings in the Amarna tablets; Bar-Rkb of Senjirli speaks of his allies as 'my brothers the kings,' and so Hiram addressed Solomon (9¹³). **33.** *Now the men were watching for an omen* [EVV *sign*]: *i.e.*, all depended upon the patron's answer. *And they were quick, and 'caught it up from him'* [so Occ. K_{r.}, VSS; *cf.* JV, *vs.* EVV], *and they said, Thy brother Ben-Hadad!* —as with a sigh of relief from the suspense; the victor had committed himself. The exact mng. of the third verb in the v. is uncertain; see Note. The royal courtesy is displayed by Ahab's reception of Ben-Hadad into his own chariot. **34.** The

respective subjects of the colloquy, Ben-Hadad and Ahab, are parenthetically supplied in the EVV ; Semitic composition was not careful in this respect ; *cf.* the dialogue in II. 10¹⁶, in Hos. 14, especially v.², and frequently in the Pss., as also in the Gospels. The terms proposed by the vanquished king are restoration of captured cities and the right to extra-territorial bazaars in Damascus. For such alien markets *cf.* Neh. 13¹⁶, and see G. Boström, *Proverbiastudien* (1935), 91 ff. For the present covenant *cf.* the historical fact of the league of the two kings at the battle of Karkar. The statement about *the cities which my father took from thy father* has been naturally connected with 15^{18ff.}, an account of a Ben-Hadad's successful wars against Baasha with names of cities smitten. This would give three kings of that name. But see Comm. on the earlier passage with denial of this interpretation and understanding of the B.-H. there and here as the same person. The term 'father' is indefinite, as here in the second case ; Baasha was not Ahab's ancestor. However we may not place reliance on quoted sayings in a story ; the story-teller here had doubtless the earlier reference in mind.

VV.³⁵⁻⁴³. The theatrical parable presented by *some one of the sons of the prophets* to the king in condemnation of his leniency to Ben-Hadad. The fate of the first comrade, who did not obey the word of YHWH, was an omen of the disaster to befall Ahab. **37**. The second comrade obeyed, *smiting and wounding him*, and so the prophet could face the king with his own example as martyr to the word of God. **38**. The prophet *disguised himself with a headband above his eyes* [not with ashes, so AV]. VV.³⁹⁻⁴⁰ present a lively scene of the back door of ancient military practices. The *talent of silver* is indeed an exaggerated figure, invented for appeal to the king's sympathy for a poor man ; as Šanda notes, in the Assyrian age a slave cost about one mina, with a silver talent at 3000 shekels, and 50 shekels to the mina. The royal answer is judicial : *Just so is thy verdict ; thou hast decided*—there is no appeal ! **41**. The king recognized the unknown as a prophet, when he had uncovered his wrapping, through some professional marking, evidently on the forehead ; for such usage *cf.* Eze. 9⁴, 'a *taw* (cross) upon the foreheads' ; markings on the chest (so the meaning of 'between the hands') of a prophet are evidenced

by Zech. 13⁶; and they might become a sign of the faithful at large, e.g., Is. 44⁵, "and this one shall write in his hand, YHWH's." ³ 42. The prophet's response is replica of Nathan's "Thou art the man!" (2 Sam. 12⁷). *The man whom I had devoted to destruction*: so or similarly EVV: the Heb. is curt: *the man of my ban*. 43. The going of the king to his house [OGrr. om.] is an intrusion from 21⁴, induced by the same accompanying phrase. He went off *sullen and vexed, and he came to Samaria*. But he laid no hand on the prophet.

Ch. 20. To vv.^{10, 13, 15, 16} belong four fragments of the Cairo Genizah Aquilanic text published by Burkitt and Taylor (see Int., §4, c), and reproduced in OTG. They read *Ἀδεδ vs. Ἀδερ*, and give the tetragrammaton in Heb. characters. 1. הדר: 2 MSS הדר, see Note, 15¹⁶.—מלך ארם: OGrr. om., Jos. has; acc. to St. 'scribal expansion.' ℳ has 'Edom' throughout the ch., on which Berlinger remarks (*Die Peschitta*) that the change was made out of 'national pride'; but Barhebræus recognized that the word meant 'Syria.'—קבץ ו': Grr. read: "collected all his army and went up and besieged Samaria, and thirty-two kings with him, and (ℳ+ 'all') horse and chariot; and they went up and besieged Samaria and fought against it." St. argues that Gr. through 'Samaria' 1⁰ represents the original text, and the rest of ℳ is secondary; rather the duplication in Gr. was made to include the pl. 'they.'—2. מלאכים: OGrr. om.; see Note 10².—העירה: ℳ ℳ ℳ om., and so St.; but the word means 'the citadel.'—3. בניך הטובים: a superlative expression; ℳ om. the adj. as unintelligible, as do modern critics who accept the Gr. variations in this section, e.g., St. (*cf. BH*), replacing the adj. with וּבְנוֹתֶיךָ; but ℳ correctly tr. with *τα τεκνα σου τα καλλιστα*.—5. כי: read by Grr. as אבני, a change accepted by Kamp. (with further emendation), St. (*cf. BH*), but unnecessarily, it having here as often strong affirmative sense—"I did send to thee . . . but."—וּבְנֵיךָ: some Grr. om.—6. עיניך: Grr., ℳ ℳ ℳ as 'their eyes'; but see Comm.—7. וּקְנֵי הָאֲרִיץ: OGrr., 'the elders.'—וּלְבָנֵי: Grr., ℳ ℳ+ 'and for my daughters,' exc. ℳ, for which see Comm.—וְלֹאֵי וְלֹחֲבֵי וְלֹחֲבֵי Grr., ℳ ℳ as though לא וְלֹא; Aq. = ℳ.—8. כל: 1⁰; MS 253, Grr. om.—אֵל תִּשְׁמַע וְלֹאֵי תִּשְׁמַע: 2 MSS לא for אל; for variation of negative particles *cf. Am. 5⁵*.—9. לְאֲדֹנָי הַמֶּלֶךְ: Grr., ℳ ℳ 'your lord,' and OGrr. om. 'the king'; the former arbitrary change is accepted by St.—הַגִּבּוֹרִים: in the Gr. tradition (exc. Hebræus, ℳ), 'the men,' unnecessarily accepted by St.—10. For the adjuration see Note, 19².—יִשְׁעוּן: (7 MSS יִשְׁעוּן): *cf. 19²*.—לְיָדֵיךָ: ℳ correctly, *τοῖς ὄραξι*, 'in handfuls,' and

³ Mohammed had such a sign in his flesh: "the seal of the prophet stood between his shoulders like the mark of a cupping-glass"; Ibn Hisham's *Life of the Prophet*, ed. F. Wüstenfeld, 2, 122, 139, 141.

so Jos., *κατα δρακα*; Aq., *τ. λιχασιν*, 'in pinchfuls'; S^{H} S^{H} *τ. αλωπεξιν*, 'for foxes' = S^{H} , as for S^{H} S^{H} .—11. *רבו*: Grr., *ικανοσθω* (S^{L} + *νμιν*), as = *רבו*, 'enough,' as at 19⁴, accepted by St.; for other attempts at revision see St., *BH*; but H is unimpeachable, "Speak the proverb for yourselves!"—*הָרַךְ*: Grr., *ο κυρτος*, 'the hump-backed,' with LHeb. *הָרַךְ*, 'lame,' in mind; then guessing at *הַצֵּמֶת* with *ο ορθος*, 'the straight-backed'; the same interpretation in S^{H} despite Aq. T has a rambling non-literal expansion.—12. *כַּשֵּׁנָה*: Grr., S^{H} by expansion, "when he answered to him this word."—*הַגְּלִיבִים*: Grr. pref. 'all.'—*שִׁיבוּ*: for the mng. see Comm., corroborated by I. Eitan's study, *A Contribution to Biblical Lexicography* (1924), 60 ff.; cf. a rendering in Poole, 'insistite'; Grr. interpret with *οικοδομησατε χαρακα*; cf. T P , and Rashi with "set up the instruments of siege."—13. *אָהָב*: OGrr., C om.—*כֵּל*: S (B v) I om.—*וַיִּדְעַת וּג'*: cf. v.²⁸, and the current phrase in Eze. and P; Burn. lists the occurrences.—14. *הַמְּרִינֹת*: OGrr., *τ. χωρων* (B *al.* *χωρων*!), Aq., *επαρχιων*, Hex. (A = S^{H}) *πολεων*.—*וַיִּצְאֵר* 2⁰: Grr. + 'Ahab'; the same plus to *וַיִּפְקֵר*, v.¹⁵.—15. *וַיִּשְׁלִיחַ*: S^{L} + *κ.* *ο βασιλευς Εξερ μετ αυτου*, a gloss to *אֵתוּ עִיר אֵתוּ*, v.¹⁸, intruded here; see Burkitt, p. 28, Rahlfs, SS 3, 285.—[הַעַם]: *כל*: MS 30, OGrr. om. as too small a figure for all Israel.—*בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל*: Grr. as though *בְּנֵי חַיִל*, induced by v.¹⁹.—'7000': OGrr., '60,000' (B '60'); for the figure St. *cf.* 19¹⁸.—16. *וַיִּצְאוּ*: MS 70 *וַיִּצְאוּ* = Grr., and S^{L} with plus, 'the king with them.'—*שְׁתֵּה שְׂבוּרָה*: cf. 16⁹.—*בְּבִכּוֹת*: Grr., 'in Succoth.'—17. *וַיִּשְׁלַח בְּן הָרַד וַיִּגִּידוּ לוֹ*: OGrr., "and they sent and reported to the king of Syria"; St. regards the Gr. as substantially the true text; St. would simplify to "and they sent to Ben-Hadad"; Burn. sugg. that the verb is impersonal with the subj. 'erroneously supplied'; but H can well stand: the king *sent out* (so excellently EVV) spies.—*וַיִּצְאוּ*: OGrr. om.—19. *אֵלֶּה*: Grr. (exc. S^{L} , ignoring the word), as *אל* (!), "let them not go out." Kit. attempted an extensive reconstruction, not repeated in *BH*.—20. *וַיְבֹרֵךְ אִישׁ אִישׁ וַיִּשְׁבַּח*: St. unnecessarily corrected the verb to sing. OGrr. have a plus: *κ. εδευτερωσεν εκαστος τον παρ αυτου*, in which *εδευτερωσεν* is a gloss, noting that "he (the scribe) repeated" the phrase *εκαστος τον παρ αυτου*—an early bit of textual criticism in a confused passage.—*וַיִּגְּבוּ אִרְבֵּי*: 2 MSS *וַיִּגְּבוּ*, and so Gr. B A *al.* as sing. (= *BH*), so as to obtain parallelism with the sing. verb in the following "Israel smote them"; but the pl., as of magnitude, was intentional here, as also at vv.²⁷⁻²⁸ with 'Aram' as subj.; cf. GK §145, 2.—*מִלְכֵי*: B *al.* erroneously, *βασιλευς*.—*עַל סוּם וּפָרָשִׁים*: OGrr., 'on a horse-man's horse,' as though for *עַל סוּם פָּרָשׁ*; Hex., 'with some horsemen'; P 'with his horsemen' (cf. EVV); T 'and with him two pairs of horsemen.' There is to be accepted W. R. Arnold's judgment, presented above in Note on 1⁵, refusing to *פָּרָשׁ* the mng. of 'horsemen'; he suggested for this passage the tr., 'because of his chariot- and cavalry-horses'; but rather the phrase was

a commonplace, as we might say, 'on horse and steed.'—21. γ י: Grr. as $\eta\gamma$ י, favoured by comm. since Then.; but Jos. = η , which can be supported by rdg. foll. η הב as inf. abs., $\eta\eta$ י. There is to be accepted Dr. Orlinsky's personal advice that $\epsilon\lambda\alpha\beta\epsilon\nu$ for γ י is corruption of $\epsilon\beta\alpha\lambda\epsilon\nu$; for a similar case cf. Josh. 15¹⁶.—22. להשיב את השנה: Jos. makes the season that of spring; see Lexx. for earlier discussions, and Begrich, *Chronologie*, 88 f., interpreting the phrase as of the sun's 'turning point.' In 2 Ch. 36¹⁰ it is used of a fixed calendar date, but here it means the opening of the military season; see Comm., and cf. Kit.—23. אלהיהם: Grr., 'the God of Israel.'—אם לא: cf. II. 9²⁶, and see Burn., König, *Syntax*, §391, m; cf. Engl. 'if we shall not?' = 'we shall.'—25. אתה תמנה: $\text{E } \text{G}^{\text{L}}$ $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\zeta\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$ σοι = E^{H} ; G^{L} $\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\zeta\omicron\nu$ συ (MS b); by misreading of the verb as תמנה, through easy confusion of early μ and ν .—אזמם מאותך: many MSS Ken., deR. present מאתך, אזמם, readable as מאתך (and so 4 MSS Ginsb.), אזמם, as is expected; the incorrect spelling occurs in these North Palestinian narratives, and occasionally in Jer., Eze.; see Burn. for occurrences. The confusion already existed in Aq.'s mind and text with his representation of the acc. particle with $\sigma\nu\nu$. The prep. את disappeared in later Heb.; it is absent in the list of prepositions in Albrecht, *Neuhebr. Gramm.*, §12; the classical prep. was early confused with the sign of the acc.—מאותך: B E om.—לקלם: the suffix in B ν = $\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\nu$.—26. אפקה: linguistically to be identified with פקא, e.g., Job 6¹⁵, 'water-spring, current,' appearing as פקא in Ugaritic (see Gordon, *Ugar. Handbook*, 3, s.v.). Five Biblical places with this name are listed by Abel, *GP* 2, 246 f. For earlier review of identifications see Döllner, *GES* 238 ff. The question arises here as between the place in the entrance to the Valley of Jezreel by Gilboa (Josh. 12¹⁸)—so e.g., Kit., Šanda, and most recently S. Tolkowsky, *JPOS* 2 (1922), 145 ff., and identification with Fik, E of the Lake of Galilee, with the *Onomasticon*, and so Albr., *JPOS* 2 (1922), 184 ff., who speaks of it as "commanding the pass on the road from Damascus to Jordan, as attested by Yakut"; Abel accepts this identification, which would presume the occupation of Transjordan by Israel. Tolkowsky argued that the earlier planned strategy (v. 23) to fight in the 'plateau' (but מישור, not עמק, which is used of Esdraelon), does not suit such a mountainous locality; but circumstances may have altered strategy.—27. התפקרו: for the Hothpaal see GK §54, b; Brock., *GVG* 1, 538.—וכללו: OGrr. om.; St. deletes by reason of the syntax—a weak enough ground in these narratives; cf. Dr., *Tenses*, §132, with most of such cases cited from Ki. The mng., 'provisioning,' appears for the Pilpel (e.g., 4⁷), which however has various significations, probably through confusion of distinct roots; connexion of the verb here with Syr. and Arab. root *ky*l would be satisfactory, 'were counted,' as military term.—וידנו בני ישראל: OGrr. as though וידן ישראל, which St., *BH* prefer; but the individualization

is to be preferred, in line with following 'kids.'—הַשִּׁי: Grr., ποιμνια = other VSS; for the unique word (*cf.* lengthy discussion in Poole) the best explanation comes from Šanda, as from root=Arab. *ḥasafa*, 'to drive (sheep)'; see Freytag, *Lex.*; the root should then be pointed השָׁף.—28. וַיֵּאמֶר: 1^o MS om.; 2^o וַיֵּאמֶר: Grr. as sing.; expected, Grr. om.; שׁ וּ also simplify here.—אָמְרוּ: Grr. as sing.; but *cf.* v. 20.—וַיִּרְעָבּוּ: correct with MSS 253, 260 to וַיִּרְעָבּוּ=v. 13, and so Grr.; the pl. arose from the constant Ezekelian expression (Eze. 23¹⁹, etc.).—29. בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל: *cf.* v. 27; the Gr. reduction to 'Israel' is simplification.—'100,000': שׁ^ל '120,000.'—30. אֶל הָעִיר: 1^o is unnecessary; by 2^o the citadel is meant; for St.'s reduction of the v. see Comm., and for attempted corrections Haupt, *BH.*—הָדָר בְּהָרָה: *cf.* הָדָר בְּיָוֶה, etc.; Jos., "he was hidden in an underground house," with which *cf.* Phœn. use of ה' for the tomb.—31. וַיֵּאמְרוּ . . . שְׂמַעְנוּ: OGrr. as "and he said to his servants, I know," and *inf.*, 'our lives'—this to make the surrender more abject.—בֵּית [יִשְׂרָאֵל]: OGrr. ignore; but despite St., Šanda, who would elide it, the phrase is good Aram. designation of a country.—בְּרֵאשִׁיטָה: read pl. בְּרֵאשִׁיטָיִם (and so it is in v. 32) with 62 MSS=VSS. For use of the prep. *cf.* Luke 15²², 'a ring in his finger,' and an Elephantine Aḥīkar papyrus, 'a millstone in his neck' (col. vi, 2, Cowley, *Aram. Papyri*, 214).—32. וַיֵּאמְרוּ: וַיֵּאמְרוּ: Grr. simplifying, "and they said to the king of Israel."—נַפְשֵׁנוּ: B שׁ^ל 'our life.'—33. וְהֵאֲנִישִׁים יִרְחָשׁוּ: *cf.* Dr., *Tenses*, §30 f.; there is no reason to read וַיִּרְחָשׁוּ with Kit., or to make the verb a perf. with St., Šanda. The root of the verb (=לְחַשׁ, 'to whisper') is used of divination, *e.g.*, Num. 23²³, 24¹, where it is repeated in שׁ^ל שׁ^ל, being common in Aram.; here, as Piel, in receptive sense=Grr., οἰσωσάμεντο, שׁ^ל "acciperunt pro omine." The sentence is prefaced with a unique gloss in שׁ^ל, "and Ben-Hadad was an augur."—וַיִּחְלְפוּ אֶת הַמִּלֻּחֵם: Or. rdg.: Occ. rdg. in 10 MSS and KṚ., וַיִּחְלְפוּ אֶת הַמִּלֻּחֵם (see Bär, Ginsb.)=VSS; EVV follow Or. rdg., JV Occ. rdg. The root חָלַף is of obscure mng.; VSS tr. with 'to snatch, catch.' Connexion with the root חָלַף (*e.g.*, Dt. 25¹⁰), as proposed by Gesenius in his *Thesaurus*, was first suggested by al-Fasi; see Skoss's ed., vol. 1, 552. Light may be thrown by Arab. *ḥalaḥa*, 'omnia arcana alicui dixit' (Freytag, *Lex.*). There is no evidence that the verb is Hifil, *vs.* Lexx.—וַיַּעֲלֶה: VSS, exc. שׁ^ל, as pl. verb.—34. וַיֵּאמֶר אֵלָיו: שׁ^ל "and said the king of Syria to Ahab."—הָרִצָּה: שׁ^ל שׁ^ל אֵלָיו tr. with the pl. of *sūḳ*, 'market.'—וַאֲנִי בְּבֵרִית אֲשַׁלַּח: GV FV EVV add in parenthesis 'said Ahab,' and so Poole's authorities demand; this understanding is supported by the introductory 'and I (for my part)'; *cf.* the indefiniteness of subject just above; unnecessary corrections have been proposed (see St.), *e.g.*, by Wellh., retaining וַאֲנִי as emphatic obj., and rdg. הַשְׁלָחַי.—וַיַּעֲלֶה: EVV correctly, "and waited for the king"; for this use of the verb *cf.* Eccl. 2⁹, "my wisdom waited on me."—[הָרָרָה]: אֵל: some 35 MSS correctly עָלָה.—אֶפְרָיִם, also v. 41, †: OGrr., A tr

correctly with *τελαμών*, 'bandage,' and so **Ⓣ**; Aq., Sym., **Ⓢ^h Ⓢ^h Ⓢ^h** understood as אפר, 'dust,' and so AV 'ashes.'—**39.** קָרַב: Grr., 'army,' rdg. אָרַב—קָרַב: Grr. om., **Ⓢ** has.—יָבֵא: B† *ἐξηγάγεν* for *εἰσηγγ.*—**40.** עָשָׂה: 'was busy' of EVV is correct; there is no reason to change to פָּנָה, as **Ⓣ Ⓢ** suggest (so Kloost.), or to שָׁעָה with Oort; see St., Eitan's Note on the verb, *op. cit.*, *sup.*, p. 56, Reider, *Textual Criticism of the O.T.*, 29.—כֵּן מִשְׁפָּטָךְ אַתָּה הַרְצִית: the first phrase=Engl. 'just so is thy judgment'; for the particle see Haupt's suggestion that it is adjectival, 'just'=Akk. *kēnu*. Grr., *ἴδου* (=הֵן?) *τα ἐνεδρα παρ ἐμοι εφονευσας*, exc. **Ⓢ^L**, *ἴδου δικαστηριον σου εφον*. The root, primarily 'to cut' (and so Grr. here, 'to murder'), came to imply determination, then judicial decision; cf. Dan. 9²⁶, and see Montg., *ad loc.*; **Ⓢ** renders with parallel פָּסַק, **Ⓢ** with 'decrevisti' (see comm. in Poole).—**41.** מֵעַל: Kṛ., קָעַל, a unique form.—**42.** מִיַּד: 3 MSS מִיַּד; Grr., 'out of my (thy) hand,' exegetical; but **Ⓢ** (=Ⓣ **Ⓢ**) is idiomatic; cf. Engl. 'out of hand.'—**43.** [בִּיתוֹ]: על: 9 MSS correctly אַל, as at 21⁴.

Ch. 21. The story of Naboth's vineyard: Ahab covets its possession, is sorely vexed at the owner's refusal to sell it at any price; Jezebel's instigation of a packed communal court, which condemns Naboth to death on a trumped-up charge, with the royal confiscation of the property; Elijah's denunciation of the king and his family; Ahab's repentance, which puts off the evil day for him. Cf. *Ant.*, viii, 13, 8.

VV.¹⁻¹⁰. The scene is laid in Jezreel, modern Zer'in, in 'the Great Valley'; the latter takes its name Esdraelon (*via* the Greek) from the town, which, lying on the ridge between its eastern and western watersheds (see Robinson's description, *BR* 3, 163 ff.), was a point of strategic importance, and also the royal countryside residence. Cf. 18⁴⁵, and the tragedy narrated in II. 9^{14ff}. Here Ahab, who is entitled *king of Samaria* (the exceptional title also in II. 1³), possessed a *palace*, the Hebrew word, *hēkāl*, of Sumerian-Akkadian origin (*ēkallu*), occurring here for the first time in the secular sense, *vs.* that of 'temple' (*e.g.*, 6³, 1 Sam. 1⁹, etc.). Desiring to enlarge his estate he offers a fair bargain to a local neighbour for purchase of the vineyard. The latter refuses, as it is his *patrimonial inheritance*, and his position was one not only of sentiment but of responsibility to his family; cf. Nowack, *Arch.*, 1, §65, 'Besitzrecht.' Ahab goes home, and acts most peevishly. **5-10.** The queen, his evil genius, acts in a wifely way to comfort her lord; she replies to his complaint with

feminine peremptoriness: *Thou* (Šanda, 'Du bist mir ein feiner König!'), *now thou hast to exercise royal right over Israel* (in EVV phrased as a question). *Get up, and eat thy meals, and thy heart be happy. I myself will give thee Naboth's vineyard.* Grotius recalls Poppæa's remark to Nero, calling him a 'boy': "qui iussis alienis obnoxius, non modo imperii sed libertatis indigeret" (*Tacitus, Ann.*, xiv, 1). In high-handed fashion *she wrote a letter* (sing., not pl.) *in Ahab's name, and sealed it with his seal* (the antique signature), *and sent the letter to the elders and freemen in his city, the fellow-citizens of Naboth.* For the elders *cf.* 20⁸; the elders of Jezreel appear again in II. 10¹. The freemen (EVV 'nobles') occur here for the first time, recurring again in Jer. 27²⁰; according to 20⁸ 'the people' are associated with the elders. For the communal classes presented *cf.* Pedersen, *Israel*, I-II, 34 ff.; for similar social development in South Arabia see Nielsen, *HAA* 1, 117 ff. As Šanda remarks, royalty may have developed ranks of gentry. In the present case the commune acts as a jury, as over against the usual judicial procedure (Dt. 16¹⁸). The 'proclamation of a fast' was to be based upon some alleged and accordingly fearful offence against Deity; *cf.* 1 Sam. 7⁶, 14^{21ff.}. Naboth's presiding (v.¹²) *in the capacity of head of the people* (so \mathfrak{H} exactly) made his alleged sin the more conspicuous. *And set two men, base fellows, to confront him.* Judicial procedure is followed by requirement of two witnesses, as in the Law (Dt. 17⁶, etc.). For 'base fellows' (AV by transliteration, following \mathfrak{B} , 'sons of Belial') see Note. Stade, Šanda regard this item as an intrusion from v.¹³, as hardly possible in the formal document; but we are not dealing with the original indictment, and in any case the queen's arrogance knew no bounds. The actual indictment of Naboth was, *Thou didst curse God and King*; \mathfrak{H} , followed by Grr., \mathfrak{B} , replaced the abhorrent verb (*cf.* Ginsb., *Introduction*, 366 f.) with 'bless' (*cf.* Job 2⁵, etc.); other VSS, modern translations avoid the euphemism. Such a curse of 'God' or 'prince of the people' was forbidden in the ancient code (Ex. 22²⁷), and blasphemy of YHWH's name was punishable by death with stoning, according to an illustrative precedent (Lev. 24^{10ff.}).

VV.¹¹⁻¹⁶. Jezebel's orders are promptly carried out. VV.^{11. 13a} contain repetitive material, and are extensively

abbreviated by Grr. and modern critics (see Notes); but the repetitions may be due to legal form (*cf.* the story of Abraham's purchase of a tomb in Gen. 25); for excision of a few words in v.¹³ see Note. For the solemnity of execution by stoning *cf.* Num. 15^{32ff.}, Dt. 13^{7ff.}, 17^{2ff.}, Acts 7^{58ff.}. **15.** The 'taking possession of Naboth's vineyard' was an act of royal confiscation, as Grotius holds, *vs.* the opinion of Kimchi and others that Ahab had some collateral right of inheritance; it was against such arbitrary power that the constitutional limitation of the rights of kings was written into the Deuteronomic code (Dt. 17^{14ff.}). **16.** *Ahab rose up to go down to Jezreel, i.e., by the descent from Samaria, to take possession.*

VV.^{17-20a.} Elijah confronts Ahab with the ironical inquiry: *Hast thou murdered and made seizure as well?* He proceeds: *In the place where the dogs licked Naboth's blood shall the dogs lick thine own blood.* There is no reason to doubt the originality of this item in the story on the ground that it was not exactly fulfilled in subsequent history. Ahab perished in battle, his body was brought to Samaria, not Jezreel, and there he was buried, and then, by development of the later story from Elijah's present word, "when they washed the chariot (of Ahab) by the pool of Samaria, the dogs licked up his blood" (22^{37f.}). And Jehu interprets the present word as fulfilled in Jezebel's fate (II. 9^{36f.}). It is another question whether by fulfilment of providential prediction or by coincidence Ahab's son was killed in Naboth's vineyard, Jehu recalling a word of YHWH against Ahab, which he construed as fulfilled in the son's fate (*ib.* vv.^{21ff.}). In angry terror the king breaks out: *Hast thou found me, my enemy?* To which Elijah curtly responds: *I have found (anglice, 'I have').*

VV.^{20b-26.} This section is redactorial supplement, based on 14^{10f.}, 16^{3, 13}. If Elijah spoke further, his word has been lost or suppressed in the present text. The anonymously uttered prediction against Jezebel (v.²³) is interdependent with II. 9³⁰⁻³⁷, the curse on Ahab's family is pure repetition, and the further judgment on Ahab (vv.^{25f.}) is equally *de trop*, especially with the condemnation of his *following idols according to all that the Amorites did*. **23.** *Read the field (of Jezreel) with II. 9²⁶, not the moat (so JV, other EVV wall/rampart), by early error of hl for hlk.*

VV.²⁷⁻²⁹. The literary origin of this section is difficult for decision. Stade makes it a continuation of vv.^{17-20a}; Kittel so regards v.²⁷, but makes vv.^{26. 28. 29} secondary, thus leaving one fragment hanging in the air. Benzinger considers it all secondary, as an attempt to ameliorate the judgment upon Ahab (v.¹⁹), which was fulfilled only in his son, and this position is to be preferred. To be sure, Ahab was not an object of absolute prophetic denunciation (*cf.* cc. 18, 20), while his present crime is attributed to the alien Jezebel's 'instigation' (v.²⁵). For the use of sackcloth see Dalman, *A. u. S.*, 5, 165, etc. *He went softly*: so EVV; the adverb proved difficult to the VSS, which omitted it or translated quite variously (see Note), and so modern Versions, *e.g.*, GV "ging jämmerlich einher," FV "il se trainait en marchant"; the sentence may well be rendered, *he went about depressed*; see Note.

1. ויהי אחר הרברים האלה כרם היה לנבות : B reduces to the last three words, and reads the first of them as וכרם, and so the other Grr. with the conj.; this latter change is to be accepted, as the syntax demands for the dependent sentence, 'now N. having a vineyard' (*Dr.*, *Tenses*, §78). Critics who prefer the rearrangement of cc. 20 and 21, also Burn., accept the shorter text of B; but this was probably due to the objection that N.'s possession of the field was not 'after these things.' Also Grr. (exc. v.= \mathfrak{C} \mathfrak{L}) have plus=*אחר* [ב'].—נבות: Gr. MS e, *Ναβουθ*; *al.*, *Ναβουθα* (B), and the like. For the name *cf.* S. Arab. names, *NPS* 1, 135, also Noth, *IP* 221, as from Arab. *nabata*, 'to sprout.'—וירעאלי: \mathfrak{C} (B A) *Ισραηλειτη*; see at 18⁴⁵.—אשר בירעאלי: Grr. om., and St. elides; but the ethnic term did not identify site of property.—היכל: Grr. (exc. \mathfrak{L} *οικω*, 2 MSS *αγρω*), 'threshing-floor,' error of $\mathfrak{N}\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{Q}$ > $\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{A}\mathfrak{Q}$, as recognized since Then.—2. אש: 3 MSS ושא=Grr. + $\delta\epsilon$; *cf.* או אש, v.⁶.—3. יהוה: Gr. 64, \mathfrak{C} , 'the Lord'; *al.* Grr., 'My God,' to which \mathfrak{L} adds 'the Lord.'—4. The v. abbreviated in \mathfrak{C} by haplog. with end of v.³.—ויכב: Grr., *κ. συνεκαλυψεν*, as though for ויכס, which Kamp., Kit. prefer, but St. rightly rejects; for the phrase *cf.* II. 20², which affected \mathfrak{Y} here + 'ad parietem.'—6. אברך—ואמר—ויאמר: for the sequence *cf.* *Dr.*, §27 ('cases of exceptional character'), and König, §§158, 366, g (as in lively narrative); rather the first two verbs are paired, while the third in normal construction expresses the sequel; a similar case in vv.^{12. 13}.—כרם: Grr. (exc. \mathfrak{L}) + 'another.'—כרמי: Grr., 'inheritance of my fathers,' from v.³.—7. אתה עתה: *cf.* 12⁴, 18^{11. 14}; it is difficult to decide as among the imperative, interrogative, ironic interpretations.—מלובה: \mathfrak{C} (B z) *βασιλεα*, this reduced in some MSS

to the vocative, βασιλευ; Ⓞ^L Ⓞ^H βασιλειαν.—8. הנפרים = Grr.; K̄r. om. ה.—אשר בעירו: OGrr. om.; see *BH* for attempts at simplification; but we have here again legal fulness.—10. [בני] בליעל: the interpretation, 'that which profits not' (the phrase = 'good-for-nothing fellows'), e.g., BDB, König, *Hwb.*, holds its own against divergent explanations, for which see Burn., GB; the interpretation by Cheyne (*EB s.v.*) as 'that which does not come up,' i.e., from hell, is well contradicted by König: the good as well as the bad do not so come up. In the Haupt. Anniv. Vol., pp. 145 f., Albr. *cf.* Akk. *mār lâ manâma*, 'son of a nobody.'—נגדו: B† om. with what follows through בני בליעל, v. 13, by haplog.; Ⓞ^H inserts practically the whole omission as from Theod., indicating an early lacuna; but Lucif., Ⓞ have the full text.—ברבת: Hex. as 3d pers., Ⓞ^H adding 'Naboth' as subj.—11. אשר השבנים בעירו: for the rel. phrase *cf.* 12⁸; St. elides as intrusion from v. 9, along with וְהִקְיִים וְג'; *cf.* *BH*.—אליהם . . . כאשר כתוב: Ⓞ^L *et al.*, Ⓞ om., and so St. as repetitive; but the composition is splay.—12. והשיבו: another case of 'irregular syntax,' generally corrected by critics; but *cf.* the parallel in v. 6.—13. אנשי הבליעל את נבות נגד העם: OGrr., Ⓞ om.; it is an inserted ungrammatical precision of persons.—14. קָטַל: the K̄al appearing in vv. 10, 13; the present is case of the ancient K̄al passive, and is to be added to the cases cited by Bergstr., *HG* 2, §15.—15. Ⓞ om. "that he was stoned and is dead," for brevity's sake; but repetition of the awful fact was intentional.—[נת] 9 MSS אַם, and so apparently Ⓞ^L Ⓞ^H read.—16a. Grr. add "and he tore his clothes and put on sackcloth, and it was after this," a wilful insertion from v. 27; Ⓞ^H has the addition without critical note; MS c₂ obelizes.—18. ה' the king of Israel, who is in Samaria'; *cf.* the title, v. 1; St. elides, but the word of יהוה would give the formal address.—הנה: the word may be vocalized הנה, *cf.* Arab. 'innahū, and so II. 1⁹, 6¹³; however הנה is used absolutely with pl. obj., e.g., II. 6²⁰, 25.—19. ה[רצהת]: Ⓞ ωσ σν = Ⓞ^H.—ודברת אליו לאמר: 2⁰: Grr. om., replacing with δια τουτο, which correction St. accepts, with insertion of לכן; but the Gr. phrase is abbreviation of the tautologous sentence.—הבלבים: Grr., 'the sows and the dogs' (Ⓞ^H obelizes the addition), and at end of the v. the Grr. plus (Ⓞ^H ÷), "and the harlots will wash in thy blood"; for these additions see 22³⁸.—20. המצאתי איני: some MSS of Ⓞ "num invenisti me inimicum tibi?" i.e., as rdg. אינך; this interpretation, accepted by some comm. in Poole, has been approved by Jouon, *Mél.*, 5, 475, on the ground that Ahab was excusing himself as never an enemy to the prophet; but this reading has no textual basis.—23. הל = Grr., 'moat'; Ⓞ^H ' (before) the wall'; 9 MSS הלק (deR., *Supplem.*, 43), as at II. 9³⁶, which acc. to Rashi is to be understood here, and so the primitive error is to be corrected. G. R. Driver attempts vindication of Ⓞ^H with a fresh etymology (*JBL* 55 [1936], 109), *cf.* Arab. *ḥaul*, 'around,' *ḥiyāl*, 'in front of.'—24. והמת: 20 MSS Ken., deR + לו = Grr.

the plus not in the original passage, 14¹¹, but is indifferent.—**25.** קר=Engl. adv. 'just,' Germ. 'gar' or 'schlechthin' (Šanda); Grr. a doublet, *πλην ματαιως*=קר קר=ס^H.—תקתה: root תקתה; סתתה is expected; but cf. תש, Ps. 73²⁸, תש, Ps. 90⁸; see GK §73, d; Bergstr., *HG* 2, §28 f (which authorities do not notice the present case).—**27.** וישם שק על בשרו ויצום וישב בשק: the Grr. (which rearrange the order of these items, and add a plus at end of the v.) tr. the first verb with *εἶωσατο*, the third with *περιεβαλετο*, which=ושב בשק in MS Ken. 210, and so al-Fāsi (ed. Skoss, I, 69) understands here; for this variation cf. II. 9¹; but for the present expression see Joel 1¹³.—אש [ויהיה]: טת, 'barefoot'=ס A, cf. Jos., *γυμνοῖς ποσι* (as Thackeray remarks, a case of Targumic influence); ס^L with inexplicable κ. τ. υιον αυτου; ס^H (A x v) *κεκλιμενος*, 'bent down'=ס^H as from Aq., Theod.; al. Grr. om. the word; V 'dimisso capite': for the sentence Rashi, 'went secretly'; Kimchi, 'went mourning,' and so GV; FV 'dragged himself in walking'; EVV 'went softly.' See St. together with Haupt's note in the volume, the latter agreeing with Rashi. P. Wechter in his study, 'Ibn Barun's Contribution to Comparative Heb. Philology,' *JAOS* 61 (1941), 172 ff., notes (p. 187) that grammarians translation with the Arabic root *ta'ta'a*, 'with depressed head.' Such a mng. appears likely here; Engl. 'depressed' may well express the word.—**28.** Grr. have a variant text.—**29.** ין כי נגע נגי: OGrr. om. by homoiot. with prec. passage, or as superfluous; similarly some Heb. MSS om. נגע . . . נגי.—אבי: Ginsb. notes MSS with אבי.

22¹⁻³⁸. The history of Micaiah the prophet and the fulfilment of the doom that he pronounced upon Ahab. || 2 Ch. 18; cf. *Ant.*, viii, 15, 3-6. Upon renewal of war with Aram Jehoshaphat king of Judah, having been persuaded to enter as Ahab's ally, requires a divine oracle, 'the word of YHWH.' Ahab's prophets, 400 in number, give optimistic augury; but Jehoshaphat, dissatisfied, asks for a real 'prophet of YHWH,' and Ahab, disgruntled, sends for one inimical to him, Micaiah ben Imlah; meanwhile Sedekiah ben Chenaanah of the former group accentuates their position with a dramatic action (vv. 5-12). Micaiah, having been fetched, tells Ahab what he wishes to hear, but, pressed for the truth by the cunning king, he declares his vision of a scene in heaven and the divine artifice planned for deceiving Ahab through falsely inspired prophets (vv. 13-23). Sedekiah's assault upon Micaiah and the latter's cryptic response to him are followed by the royal orders for his strict incarceration (vv. 24-28). In the ensuing battle at Ramoth-Gilead Ahab disguises himself in the attempt to

forestall his fate; he is mortally wounded by a stray shot, but remains heroically in his chariot until his death at even, whereupon follows the rout of the allies (vv.²⁹⁻³⁶). His body is brought to Samaria for burial, with fulfilment of an earlier word of Elijah as to the obscene end of his blood (vv.³⁷⁻³⁸). The narrative is a literary unit, with the exception of the final scene, v.³⁸, its forerunner, v.^{35b}, and a late gloss, v.^{28b}.

This dramatic story is matched only by that of Elijah's contest with the Baal prophets on Carmel, as rich as that in its detail, but superior in its historical verisimilitude. The appearance of an otherwise unknown Micaiah vouches for the originality of the story, and is evidence of a wider range of literary composition among the sons of the prophets than might have been expected. The satire of the earlier narrative (18²⁷) has its complement here in the irony of Micaiah's first response and then in the stark scene of heaven with *the spirit* who volunteered to be *a spirit of falsehood in the mouth of all his* (Ahab's) *prophets*. Grimmer and more primitive as it is, the scene is a true precedent of the visions in Am. 1-2, Is. 6, and warns modern study against finding too sharp a distinction from 'the Writing Prophets.' In his inscrutable way the God of these early prophets is the author of what Gentiles called the Fate of the beliers of Him who rules in human affairs. Josephus (*Ant.*, viii, 15, 6), writing for the Gentiles, well concludes: "With the king's history before our eyes, it behoves us to reflect on the power of Fate (τοῦ χρεῶν), and see that not even with foreknowledge is it possible to escape it, for it secretly enters the souls of men and flatters them with fair hopes, and by means of these it leads them on to the point where it can overcome them" (tr. of Thackeray-Marcus).

1. *They sat still, i.e., at peace (EVV continued) for three years, i.e., into the third year (v.²);* the narrator dates from the events in ch. 20. This dating, generally accepted by historians as original is provocative of attempts to place these narratives in the international chronology. The battle of Karkar occurred in 854/853 B.C., Ahab's death in 852/851 (the dates of Meyer and Robinson), and there must have been remarkable revolutions in the relations between Israel and

Syria, with Ahab's success over Aram at an earlier date.¹

2. The alliance of Jehoshaphat with Ahab had been cemented by the marriage of the latter's daughter to the former's son and heir (II. 8¹⁸); this *rapprochement* between the North and the South was brought about by the Aramæan peril, which had come to life again after the temporary coalition of Syrian states at Karkar. Ramoth-Gilead was the governmental seat of one of Solomon's provinces (4¹³); it has been identified by Dalman with Tell el-Huşn, SE of Irbid-Arbela (*Pjb.*, 1913, 64; cf. Albright, *BASOR* 35 (1929), 11; Abel, *GP* 2, 430); but now for another identification by Glueck see *Comm.*, 4^{7n.}, n. 1.

5. 6. For the consulting of YHWH before battle cf. 1 Sam. 23^{1n.}, and Zakar of Hamath's consultation of 'seers and astrologers' (Montgomery, *JBL* 28 [1909], 68 f.). The number 400 for the prophets of YHWH assembled appears extravagant, and is suspiciously correspondent to the 450 of Baal prophets and the 400 of Asherah prophets in 18¹⁹. These prophets are distinctly YHWH's devotees, representing the state religion; according to the sequel of ch. 18 the Baal prophets had been exterminated.

7-9. Jehoshaphat, dissatisfied (cf. Ahab's distrust of Micaiah's oracle) asks for a further oracle: *Is there not here yet another prophet of YHWH?* He may well have been suspicious of the extravagant development of prophecy in the North, unlike the simpler religion of the conservative South; the North was peculiarly exposed to the frenzied religionism of Phœnicia and Syria. In reply Ahab names Micaiah, upon whom he remarks: *I hate him, for he prophesies not good concerning me but evil.* Grotius well compares Agamemnon's word to the seer Colchas (*Il.*, i, 106): *μάντι κακῶν, οὐ πώ ποτέ μοι τὸ κρήγυρον εἶπας.* Jehoshaphat answers deprecatively like a gentleman, but has his way.

¹ For more detailed study of the chronology see Šanda (placing the battles of Karkar and Ramoth-Gilead in the spring and autumn of 854 respectively), Kittel, *GI* 2, 253 ff. (suggesting, p. 256, that Shalmaneser was ill-informed of the Israelite king's name), Meyer, *GA* 2, 2, 274 ff., 333 ff.; Robinson, *HI* 1, 292 ff.; and the Chronologies of Begrich, Lewy, Mowinckel. These three vary considerably in dating Ahab's death-year, *i.e.*, respectively at 851, 847, 853 B.C. The study of the chronology of the period in Morgenstern's 'Chronological Data of the Dynasty of Omri,' opens with this v. as basis of discussion. See Bibliography in *Int.*, §16.

10. The dramatic, courtly scene (*cf.* the scene in heaven, *inf.*) plays in a threshing-floor at the entrance of the gate of Samaria; the first phrase is absent in the Grr., is much disputed by critics, but it may well have been a local name (*cf.* 'the Haymarket' in London—possibly read here 'the threshing-floor'), and is not to be lightly cancelled; as Šanda remarks, such an arena was required for the 'cultic-gymnastic' rites which followed. *With all the prophets prophesying before them*: we may only speculate on the frenzied rites; *cf.* ch. 18, and Lucian's testimony for a later age (*De Dea Syra*, 36 *seq.*). **11.** Sedekiah's pronouncement is reminiscent of the ancient oracle to Joseph (Dt. 33¹⁷). Šanda notes similar ascriptions to Thutmose III and Seti II as 'invincible,' 'a young bullock with horns.' **13. 14.** The marshal who fetches Micaiah is benevolently inclined towards him with politic advice. The prophet's reply (*cf.* Luther's, 'Ich kann nicht anders') is non-committal. **15.** His oracle to the king betrays itself as dramatic irony: "he made use of mimicry"; "he did not deceive the bystanders, because even the king was sensible to the ridicule"; so comm. in Poole. **16.** The king commands that he put aside this by-play. **17.** The prophet recites the vision vouchsafed to him:

*I saw all Israel scattered upon the mountains,
As sheep that have no shepherd.*

And YHWH said:

*These have no master:
Return they each to his home in peace!*

The scansion of these originally metrical utterances is uncertain; Haupt attempts rewriting. **18.** Ahab comments to Jehoshaphat with "I told you so."

VV.¹⁹⁻²³. The prophet continues with a further vision, now of heaven itself. **19.** *I saw YHWH sitting on his throne, and all the host of heaven standing by him*—an utterance that precedes that of Isaiah's vision (ch. 6). **20.** In the vision YHWH asks for a volunteer from the host of heaven who will entice Ahab, that he may go up and fall at Ramoth-Gilead. Excuse for this divine action cannot be found, with Cornelius à Lapide,

in the explanation, "non sunt verba iubentis, sed permittentis," although he and Grotius are correct in comparing the divine 'permission' granted to Satan, e.g., Job 1, Mt. 8^{28ff.}, Jn. 13^{26ff.}, Rev. 20³. **21.** *And there came forth the spirit, and stood before YHWH, and he said: I will entice him. And YHWH said to him: Wherewith!* **22.** *And he said: I will go forth, and will be a lying spirit in the mouth of all his prophets. And he said: Thou shalt entice, and also prevail. Go forth and do so.* Identification of 'the spirit' (with JV, other EVV 'a spirit') has been much mooted: see especially Kittel, *ad loc.*, and P. Volz, *Der Geist Gottes*, 12, 20, 78, etc. It is the personified spirit of prophecy; cf. its action in early story, 1 Sam. 10^{10ff.}, 19^{23f.}. There is also differentiation in 'an evil spirit,' which God sent between Abimelek and the Shechemites (Jud. 9²³), more explicitly in another passage, 'an evil divine spirit' (1 Sam. 18¹⁰). This phase of the spirit becomes ultimately personified in 'the Satan,' e.g., Job 1 f. Such spirits were primarily amoral in the monotheistic scheme, instruments of the divine will for good or evil. In Is. 11² we find the six-fold differentiation of the Spirit of YHWH. **23.** Micaiah comments on the celestial drama: *And now, behold, YHWH hath put a spirit of falsehood in the mouth of all these thy prophets.* The theology is primitive indeed, and has its exact parallel in the opening lines of bk. ii of the *Iliad*, when Zeus proposes to send 'a baleful dream' to Agamemnon to deceive him. Kittel cites a scholion to Sophocles, *Antigone*, 620, expressing the ancient theme of "Quem Deus vult perdere, eum dementat prius." For the much later Second Isaiah YHWH is "Fashioner of light and Creator of darkness, Maker of peace and Creator of evil" (Is. 45⁷). Theological criticism may well be temperate. Israel's developing religion faced the dilemma of all monotheism, as between the all-mightiness and the virtue of Deity. Schwally (*ZAW* 1892, 159 ff.) and Stade (*ib.*, 1895, 163 ff.—cf. the colour-scheme in *SBOT*) adjudge this scene to be secondary in the composition, Stade comparing Job 1. But the latter scene, the traditional prœmium to a late philosophic drama, is equally primitive and a parallel to our dramatic vision. However 'the spirit' (v.²¹) is not to be corrected to 'the Satan,' as has been proposed (see Haupt, and cf. note in *BH*). The present 'vision' is the most striking example

of the genius of the prophets before 'the Writing Prophets'; it is closest to Amos of the following century, and presents his and his successors' religious and literary deep-rooted background.

VV.²⁴⁻²⁸. For the personal assault upon Micaiah by Sedekiah *cf.* the experiences of Jeremiah (*e.g.*, Jer. 37¹⁵), of Paul (Acts 23²), and of Jesus buffeted along with a similar satirical inquiry (Mt. 27^{26ff.}). **24.** The jibing inquiry, *By which way—or How* (see Note) *went YHWH's spirit from me to speak to thee?*, has its ominous reply from Micaiah; unlike the parallel doom of the sceptical doubter in II. 7^{17ff.}, the sequel of fulfilment is not given. **25.** The expression of the fugitive's flight *by chamber after chamber* reappears from 20³⁰. **26-28a.** The prisoner is to be treated as a prisoner of state, remitted into the custody of *Amon the governor of the city* (for the office *cf.* Jud. 9³⁰, *inf.* II. 10¹, 23⁸, Neh. 7²) and an otherwise unknown son of Ahab, *Joash*; he is to be fed with *bread of affliction and water of affliction* (*cf.* Is. 30²⁰), apparently an official term for prison fare. The king's expression, *in peace*, means 'safe and sound.' **28a.** The prophet briefly accepts the challenge. **28b.** *And he said: Hear, ye peoples, all of you:* a gloss, absent in Ch. and in pre-Hex. Greek texts, identifying Micaiah with the canonical Micah: *cf.* Mic. 1².

VV.²⁹⁻³⁸. The battle at Ramoth-Gilead and the end of Ahab. **30.** The purpose of Ahab's disguise was not out of treachery against Jehoshaphat, as has been suggested (*e.g.*, by the Grr. with a slight change of text), but for the avoidance of fate. **31.** The number of captains, *thirty-two*, is absent in Ch., and is an intrusion from 20¹. **32.** *Jehoshaphat cried out, i.e.*, with his battle-cry (so Stade), by which he was distinguished from the Israelite king, not in prayer to God, as Ch. and Grr. glossate. **34.** Ahab was struck by an arrow *between the scale-armour and the breastplate*. Scale-armour, as the Hebrew etymologically means, is known from Egypt of the XIXth Dyn., specimens of which are in the Metropolitan Museum, New York. Very early armour of the kind has been found at Nuzi in N Iraq (*BASOR* 30 [1928], 2 f., with illustration); and more recently Schaeffer has reported the discovery of 'pieces of scale-armour' at Ugarit (*ILN* Jan. 6, 1940, 26). There has been extensive discussion of the relation

of the two parts of the armour ; the best explanation remains that of Grotius : " in ea parte ubi lorica cum inferiori armatura connectitur," the scales serving apron-like to cover the mobile upper legs and joints. Ahab orders his charioteer to retire from the battle, but stays on the side-lines, and (35a) manfully remains *propped up* in his chariot until evening, when he died. 36. *And the cry passed through the army at the going down of the sun, to wit : Each to his city and each to his land, 37a.* [correcting with the Grr.] *for the king is dead ! And they came to Samaria. 37b. 38.* The royal burial in Samaria was regular, cf. 16²⁸, II. 10³⁵ ; the statement replaces the formal archival note once preceding v.³⁹. But the further item, *and they washed the chariot by the pool of Samaria, and the dogs licked up his blood, and the harlots washed* (so curtly), *by the word of YHWH that he spoke*, is secondary, to connect with Elijah's prophecy, 21¹⁹ ; and then v.^{35b} above, introducing the otherwise unimportant theme of Ahab's blood-flow, is equally secondary. There is the added extravagance of the harlots washing themselves, *sc.* in the blood, so absurd that the VSS outside of the Grr. attempted another interpretation, which was accepted by AV, and is given in margin by RVV : *and they washed his armour* ; see Note. Harlots were intruded here by the interpretation of ' the dogs ' as professional male perverts, even as the word is used in Dt. 23¹⁹, Rev. 22¹⁵, and probably a technical cultic name in Phœnicia (CIS I, 86, B 10) ; there may be here reminiscence of obscene praxis. For the probable identification of this *pool of Samaria* see ZDPV 50 (1927), 32, and the map in Galling, BR 442.

VV.^{39. 40.} The summary of Ahab's reign, originally the sequel of ch. 16. The phrase, *all that he did*, had doubtless far more significance in Ahab's case than in the current use of the formula. *The ivory house that he built* : cf. Amos 3¹⁵, and ' the ivory palaces ' of Ps. 45⁹ (but see Gunkel, *ad loc.*, amending to ' ivory instruments ' of music), and Solomon's throne of ivory and gold (10¹⁸). This description of the palace, so named because of its ivory ornamentation, panelling, etc., is now fully corroborated by the rich finds of beautiful inlay work in Ahab's palace at Samaria ; see J. W. Crowfoot, QS 1932, 132 ff. ; 1933, 7 ff., 130 ff. ; ILN Dec. 16 and 23, 1937 ; J. A. Wilson, AJA 1938, 333 ff. ; C. de Hertenfeld, Syria,

1938, 345 ff. ; and the sumptuous and comprehensive volume by G. Loud, *The Megiddo Ivories* (1939). These latter are objects of the 13th and 12th centuries, and have their complement in Thutmose III's report of his booty gained at Megiddo, 'three staffs, with human heads, of ivory,' and 'six large divans of ivory and wood' (*ARE* 2, §436). Similar rich finds have been made at an ancient site to the N of Aleppo ; see F. Thureau-Dangin, *Arslan Tash*, 1931, 89 ff. For the abundant Phœnician ivories see Contenau, *La civilisation phénicienne*, 219 ff. ; Otto, *HA* 1, 805 ff. ; R. D. Barnett, 'Phœnician and Syrian Ivory Carving,' *PEQ* 1939, 4 ff., with 11 plates. Also see at large Watzinger, *DP* 1, 112 ff. ; Galling, *BR* s.v. 'Elfenbein.' Cf. Comm. on 10^{18ff.} For *all the cities that he built* is to be compared the contemporary Mesha's list of such constructions ; but for Ahab only the record of the rebuilding of Jericho has survived (16³⁴). A splendid type of tower, semi-circular in form, discovered at Samaria, remains as a sample of royal architecture in the North (*QS* 1934, plates ii, iii).

VV.⁴¹⁻⁵¹ (with Heb. prints, JV, following ffl ; other EVV make one v. out of vv.⁴³⁻⁴⁴). The reign of Jehoshaphat of Judah. || 2 Ch. 17-20 ; cf. *Ant.*, ix, 1-3. Jehoshaphat appears again in II. 3^{4ff.} 41. The accession is dated *in the fourth year of Ahab*, but according to v.⁵² Ahab's successor came to the throne in Jehoshaphat's 17th year, while with 16²⁹ Ahab reigned 22 years—*i.e.*, a discrepancy of 5. See Note for the problem and the Gr. attempts at correction. Jehoshaphat is the second Judæan king (with Abijam first, but the name in curtailed form) to have a name compounded with the divine element YHWH , which thereafter appears constant in the Southern dynasty, except for Manasseh and Amon. The element appears for the first time in the Northern royal names with the contemporary sons of Ahab, and continues into the Jehu dynasty. 43. For Asa's example, which his son followed, see 15^{11f.} 44. *However* (even as then) *the high-places were not removed*. The *entente cordiale* with the king of Israel is illustrated in the prophetic story above ; as the present section shows, there was the attempt at a N-S alliance to meet the Aramæan and Assyrian perils from the east. The Israelite king's name is not given, and the v., out of place, is probably

dependent upon that prophetic story. This 'peace' was doubtless consummated in the ill-starred matrimonial alliance with the Northern dynasty, Jehoshaphat's son Jehoram marrying Ahab's daughter Athaliah (II. 8¹⁸. 26^f, II). 2 Ch. 18¹ notes here that Jehoshaphat "allied himself in marriage with Ahab," and such an item may once have stood here; the mother's name is ignored in the passage where it should regularly appear (II. 3¹). VV.⁴⁸⁻⁵⁰ present another invaluable record of the ancient Red Sea commerce; cf. 9^{26ff}. 10²², and see Comm. *ad locos*. The incident occurred in the latter part of the king's reign in connexion with Ahaziah ben Ahab, as he is named in good Semitic fashion. Several corrections of the corrupt passage are required, and have been variously accepted; see Notes for the text. The following revision is presented. 48. *And there being no king in Edom, a royal lieutenant (49) [with correction of Mas. verse-division, and deletion of Jehoshaphat] made [see Note] a Tarshish-ship [sing. with ♂, ♀ pl.] to go to Ophir for gold; but he did not go, for it was broken [♂ ships were broken, with Kr. correcting sing. Kt.] at Esyon-geber. 50. Then said Ahaziah ben Ahab to Jehoshaphat: Let my servants go with thy servants in the ships [♂ ship]; and Jehoshaphat did not agree.* The Northern king with his Phœnician backing might well have provided better ships and sailors; cf. Solomon's dependence upon Hiram of Tyre. But Jehoshaphat feared the intrusion of his Northern neighbours into his own particular littoral. Since the reference to the restoration of the Edomite monarchy in Solomon's day (II¹⁴⁻²². 25) Edom has not been mentioned in Ki.; but 2 Ch. 20 has a long history of Jehoshaphat's campaign against Ammon, Moab and Mount Seir, and according to 17¹¹ the Philistines and the Arabs were tributary to him. See the summaries for Edomite and Moabite history from the archaeological point of view by Glueck in *AASOR* 15 (1935), 137 ff.; 18-19 (1939), 242 ff. While the brunt of the war with Aram was borne by Israel, Judah appears to have attacked Aram's avenues towards the Red Sea by an attempted push to the south; the lieutenant actually constructed on the Gulf of Akabah a ship, which however was immediately wrecked. Then the Israelite king's offer of assistance was prudently refused by the Judæan, for the former desired to control the

Trans-Jordan routes, the latter to divert them to Cis-Jordan. This Judæan control of Edom was brief; in the days of the successor Edom was able to re-establish its independence with a king (II. 8^{20a}), even as similarly "Moab rebelled against Israel after the death of Ahab" (II. 1¹). For the 'Tarshish ship' see above on 10²², for Esyon-geber on 9²⁶. G here read 'Aram' for 'Edom,' this the easier induced by the item of the Tarshish ships; and so Josephus romances (*Ant.*, ix, 1, 4) on the shipping to 'Pontos and the emporia of Thrace.' Still earlier 2 Ch. had these ships made 'to go to Tarshish,' and condemns Jehoshaphat as having wrought wickedly in joining with Ahaziah, the shipwreck being by prophetic word the divine penalty (20³⁵⁻³⁷).

1. וישבו: "they stayed still," as at Jud. 5¹⁷, etc.; there is no reason to change to sing., with Ahab implied as subj., with Grr. (exc. x), S^H , St.—3. הידיעתם = "do ye not know?"; see R. Gordis, *AJSL* 49 (1933), 212 ff.—רָמָה נ': so G^L , al. Grr. = רָמָה: see Note, 4¹³.—4. ויאמר: Grr. (exc. d 106) + 'the king of Israel' similar expansions below, vv. 6. 7. 8. 20. 30. 32, and cf. Ch.—5. דרש: Grr. (exc. G^L), "let us inquire" = v. 7.—[G^L] דבר: Grr. om.—as unnecessary.—6. הנהיאים: Grr. pref. 'all.'—ויתן: Grr., $\delta\epsilon\delta\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \delta\omega\sigma\epsilon\iota$, as though ונתן יתן; for original inf. abs. cf. II. 3¹⁸.—ארגי: ca. 29 MSS, T יהוה, which is required; the change made to avoid the use of the Name by those prophets; Ch., אלהים.—7. עורר: Grr. (exc. a = Sym.), P om.; Grr. also om. the word in v. 8; omission on purpose to avoid classification of true prophets with false (St.).—מאותו: many MSS, edd., מאתו, and so Kt. in v. 8; read מאתי; cf. Note, 20²⁶.—8. מיכיהו: the name might be regarded as of contemporary formation from the Akk., after the form, *mannu-ki-X*, but it occurs earlier in Jud. 17; the name now occurs on a seal, *IAE* 190.—ימלה: 2 MSS (Ginsb.) ימלא = Ch.; the latter a Palm. name.—9. סרים: on this official title see Note, II. 18¹⁷.—10. ו MS om. בגין, and so the Grr., with simplification of טלבושים בגדים to *ενοπλοισι*, 'armed'; Sym., followed by S^H renders B ; Ch. repeats ישבו before בגין; S tr. בגין with adj. ברור, 'bright (clothing)'; for proposed corrections see Burn., St., who most unnecessarily would cancel the word as a dittog.—12. ביד המלך: Grr., 'into thy hands also the king of Syria.'—13. רבתי: Grr. as רבתי (+ *παυτες*), so easing a 'harsh' construction (Burn.); with St. B is to be kept supported as it is by the other VSS; כינוי is nominal as below.—רבתיך: Kr. רבתיך = Ch. Kt., T S P ; Grr. = Kt.; see Note, 3¹².—15. נחל, הנלך: the royal pl.; Grr. as sing.: Ch. conforms the foll. impvs. to these pls.—16. רק: practically a prep., cf. Engl. 'but'; P 'nisi'; ו MS om. prec. לא = Grr.—17. ויאמר: Grr. + 'not so,' introduced from v. 19.—[ההרים]: 3

MSS על=Ch.=⊕ Ⓢ^H (Grr., εν), which is to be accepted.—להם: Ch. להן. the noun אָן is mostly fem.; but here the personal reference may have induced the masc.—לא אדנים לאלה: Grr. misunderstood: Ⓢ Ⓢ^H ου κυριος toutois theos, cf. Ⓢ^H 'the Lord not Lord to them'; Ⓢ^L ει (rdg. as κῆ) κυριως ('legally'?) αυτοι προς θεον (as ἱεραὶ).—18. יתנבא: Grr.+outws, from v. 12.—19. לבן: Grr., ουχ outws ουκ εγω, and inf. ουχ outws, this as by first rdg. לא אנבי, and then the gloss correction entered twice. לבן is elsewhere taken as כן; see Dr. on 1 Sam. 3¹⁴.—20. יהוה: Ⓢ 'the God of Israel,' to avoid vision of YHWH; cf. the text of Is. 6¹.—20. בכה bis: Ch. בכה bis; there is no reason, with St., BH, to amend this unique adverbial phrase.—Ad fin. Ⓢ^L κ. ειπεν, ου δυνηση, κ. ειπεν, εν σοι: δυνηση from v. 22, εν σοι as rdg. בכה; see Rahlfs, SS 1, 80 ff.—21. הרוח: for the gender, masc. here, see Note, II. 2¹⁵.—22. אי זה עבר רוח י' נאחי לרבר: 6 MSS deR., Ch., לרוח.—24. אי זה הרוד וג': for the gender, masc. here, see Note, II. 2¹⁵, and so Ⓢ here; Ch., (=13¹²), making the phrase more explicit, and so EVV, 'which way.' The composite particle may possibly mean 'how,' cf. the variant mng. of אִיפֶה, also Eth. 'efō. Ⓢ, ignoring עבר, ποιον πνευμα Κυριου το λαλησαν εν σοι, accepted by Burn. (cf. BH) as=בך—הערב י' אי זה רוח י' אפסתη απ εμου του λαλησαι εν σοι—these interpreting with 'what sort of a spirit.' ⊕ tr. with 'at what hour?'=Ⓐ; ♪ tr. the particles with interrogative 'ne.' St. would elide רוח; but no authority appears for correction of this originally ambiguous passage.—אותך: many MSS אאתך=Ch.; correct Ktr., to אאתך.—25. להקברה: many MSS א=Ch.—26. השיבהו, קח: Ch., Grr. as pl., but n.b. the sing. verb ישב v. 27; ♪ renders הש' with 'maneat,' as though from root ישב. The Heb. verb corresponds to the Engl. legal term, 'to remit.'—אמן=Hex.; Jos., Αχαμων; Ⓢ Ⓢ^L Εμμηρ, etc., as for אמר (B† Σεμηρ).—שר: B† τ. βασιλεια, al., τ. αρχοντα.—יואש: for the name see Note, II. 12¹.—27. כה אמר המלך: OGrr. om.; but the phrase is legal formula; cf. the similar usage in the Amarna tablets.—אי זה: cf. 1 Sam. 21¹⁶, etc.—מים לחץ: for the apposition see Dr., Tenses, §189 (1); Ⓢ^L pref. 'let him drink.'—29. מלך יהודה: Grr., exc. e, '+ with him,' which seemed necessary after the sing. verb.—30. יהושפט: Grr.+ 'king of Judah,' and so in v. 32.—התחפש ובא: for the inf. abs. without subject see Ewald, Syntax, §217, a, GK §113, dd, note; the subject 'I' is assumed, would be evident in living speech=Germ., "es ist zu verkleiden . . . aber Du——!" Grr. render with 1st pers., accepted by some critics, e.g., Kit., St., Sanda (cf. BH), rewriting with ואבא ואמך; but the text is to be retained, with Burn., cf. Eissf.—בגדיך: Grr., 'my robes' (not corrected in Ⓢ^H), by error of μω for σου, or rather by intention to read in the elements of Ahab's treachery.—32. אך: Grr., φαίνεται, as=prep. כ, cf. Syr. 'ak.—ויסרו: Ch., ויטבו, "and they surrounded"—Grr., showing early contamination from Ch.; see St., who retains ⊕.—Ad fin., Ⓢ^L+ κ. Κυριος εσωσεν αυτον; cf. Ch., "and Y. helped

him, and God diverted them from him," on the assumption that the king's cry was to God.—34. איש: Jos. identifies with 'a royal page of Adad, Amanos by name,' *i.e.*, the Naaman of II. 5, a tradition continued in *Midrash Tehillim* on Ps. 78, and accepted by Rashi.—בין הרבקים ובין השוין: see Comm., and the much vexed discussion in Then., Kit., Burn., Haupt, Šanda. VSS vary: Ⓢ as though 'the stomach' for 'בין רבקי הש'; Grr. tr. 'ה' with 'the lung' = Ⓢ, which gives 'ירך-הש': so after very many MSS Bär. Ginsb.²=Ⓢ; Mich., Ginsb.¹, ירך Kt., and so Ⓢ as pl.; the pl. in the same phrase, II. 9²³.—35. ותעלה המלחמה (Ch., 'ותעל המ'): Grr. tr. the verb with *ετροπωθη*, "was put to flight"; Ⓢ "went up the combatants"; Ⓢ "the battle was stout"; Ⓢ^H "the battle was won"; Ⓢ "commisum est proelium," and in Ch., "finita est pugna" (Joüon, *Mél.*, 5, 476, would accordingly read ותבלה); the meaning is, "the battle went up to its peak," like a flood of waters (*cf.* Burn.).—נעמור: "kept propped up" (Burn.); Ch., נעמור, which Haupt approves as="he kept, bore up," *cf.* Arab. 'aḫāma.—וימת בערב וג': Ch. ער הערב וימת; OGrr., "from early to evening, and flowed forth the blood of the wound into the hollow of the chariot, and he died at evening," *i.e.*, properly putting the item of the blood-flow before that of the death; then Ⓢ texts (not Ⓢ) add a variant restoring the sequence in Ⓢ. There is no reason, *vs.* BH, to alter Ⓢ on basis of these variations. *N.b.* that Ch. om. the item of the blood-flow.—36. ויעבר הרנה: Grr., κ. εσθη ο στρατοκρηυξ=practically all the other VSS, as though rdg. ויעבר and Καλ ppl. of רנה, or Poel ppl. of רתן; but violation of gender-relation is not uncommon in Heb. (see Note, 11³), and in certain conditions is quite regular in Arab.; it is rather absurd to think that there was a formal order of retreat.—ואיש אל ארצו: 8 MSS deR. om. איש, and so Ⓢ Ⓢ^H.—37. וימת המלך: Grr.=בימת המלך; generally accepted by critics since Then. as part of the outcry.—ויבוא: read with Grr. ויבאו; *cf.* Ⓢ, "and they brought him"; EVV "and was brought."—38. וישטף: impersonal.—והגוזלות רהצו: Grr. add "the swine [and the dogs]" and "[the harlots washed] in the blood," the latter indeed a necessary plus. Other VSS read Ⓢ, but found Aram. וין in 'הו', obtaining "and they washed his armour"; see Burn., St.

41-51. This section appears in OGrr. after 16²³, where it appears to be in place with the varying chronology (the 11th year of Omri, *vs.* the 4th of Ahab), and is repeated in a fresh translation here *in loco*, but with omission of vv.⁴⁷⁻⁵⁰; a similar repetition appears in Ⓢ in the summary for Joram of Israel *in loco*, II. 3¹⁻³, and as addition to II. 1. See Rahlfs, SS 3, 265-7, for a full discussion; he holds that the earlier passage belongs to the original Ⓢ (here cited as Ⓢ¹), while the doublet here (Ⓢ²) is also 'very old,' the Hex. marking merely the missing vv. here with asterisk. The text of Ⓢ² agrees with Ⓢ in 'the 4th year of Ahab' as *vs.* 'the 11th year of Omri' in Ⓢ¹. Rahlfs, agreeing with Thackeray's

theory of the translation of 2 Ki. by another hand than that for 1 Ki., finds in the duplicate verbal traces of the latter's style and assigns it to him. \mathfrak{C}^1 omitted the duplicate here, but made another attempt at chronology (v.⁵²) in changing the accession-date, 'the 17th year of Jehoshaphat' to 'the 24th year.' In *re* the correctness of the datings in \mathfrak{H} , we may start from the identical datum for the death of Joram b. Ahaziah b. Ahab and of Ahaziah b. Jehoshaphat (II. 9); from the 4th of Ahab's reign of 22 years (16²⁹, 22⁴¹) the round reckoning for the Northern dynasty is $22 - 4 = 18 + 2$ (22⁵²) + 12 (II. 3¹) = 32 years, for the Southern dynasty 25 (22⁴²) + 8 (II. 8¹⁷) + 1 (8²⁶) = 34 years—a close enough correspondence with the upper figure in view of the uncertainty of reckoning of initial regnal years (see Int., §16). For the datum of Ahaziah's accession in Jehoshaphat's 17th year there is the figuration of 22 years (Ahab's term) minus 4 (date of Jehoshaphat's accession) = 18—again a close approximation. We may well be sceptical as to the different accession year in \mathfrak{C}^1 ; it may be entirely artificial, invented so as to insert the formal notice of Jehoshaphat before 22¹⁸, where he appears casually as 'king of Judah.'

42. עוובה: generally interpreted as 'abandoned, divorced' (Noth, *IP* 231), but such indeed a name of ill omen. Šanda etymologizes from Arab. 'aḏab, 'sweet,' or *cf.* Heb. עוב (14¹⁰); rather it may be connected with root עוב, Neh. 3⁸ = Ugaritic 'ḏb (Gordon, *Ugar. Handbook*, 3, s.v.), *i.e.*, 'prepared'; 'ḏbt is clan and place name in S. Arab. (*NPS* 2, 307, 356). This name and the next one are peculiarly corrupted in Gr. B, *cf.* also \mathfrak{C} .—43. כל: \mathfrak{C}^1 om., probably because of the reservation in v.⁴⁴.—סא: MSS סא=סא \mathfrak{H} , but the asyndeton is idiomatic.—סאנו: Sebir סאנו, and so some MSS; for the uncertainty of gender of סרר *cf.* 13¹⁰.—44. סרו: Grr. as active verb, with sing. or pl. subj.; *cf.* 15¹⁴.—העם: \mathfrak{C}^1 om.—45. 46. וישלם יהושפט עם מלך ישראל: ויתר דברי יהושפט \mathfrak{C} by parablepsis due to the recurrence of יהושפט lost the intervening words, and translated the verb with *συνεθετο*, prefixing it with *a* to make construction with the foll. clause.—46. ואשר נלהם: \mathfrak{C}^2 om., \mathfrak{C}^1 has; St. favours the omission.—' (the chronicles of) the kings of Judah': \mathfrak{C}^1 B† 'Jehoshaphat.'—47. הקדש: collective; see Note, 14²⁴; here Hex. (A) του ενδιηλλαγμενου (correct foll. ουχ το δ, with \mathfrak{H}), *i.e.*, 'the perverted,' paralleled by Paul's condemnation of women who *μετήλλαξαν τ. φυσικὴν χρῆσιν* (Rom. 1²⁶); *cf.* Aquilanic *ἐναλλάκτης* (Is. 3⁴).—48. 49. נאום יהושפט: נאום יהושפט \mathfrak{C}^1 εν Συρια νασειβ ο βασιλευς; Hex., εν Εδωμ εστηλωμενος (= \mathfrak{H}) κ. ο βασιλευς Ιωσαφατ; *n.b.* the ancient Kṛē, attested by νασειβ, which is to be accepted; see Note, 4⁷. St.'s correction has been generally accepted: נאום יהושפט; however, following the omission of 'Jehoshaphat' in B*, 'נ' 'נ' is to be translated with 'a royal lieutenant,' the phrase inarticulate as מלך בית מלך, 15¹⁸, etc.—49. עשר Kt.; עשה Kṛ., and so many MSS. some edd., and

the VSS.—אניית 1^o : Ⓢ¹ *vauv* = אניית ; Hex., VSS here = Ⓢ with pl. ; the sing. is corroborated by the foll. Kt., נשברה, which Ⓢr. pluralized ; the impossible עשר may have induced the pl. rdg.—הלך = Ⓢ¹ Ⓢ ; Hex., Ⓢ Ⓢ tr. with pl., and so EVV ; St. corrects to הלכה with אניה as implied subj. (so Moff.) ; but the sing. masc., ' he went not,' is preferable.—אניית 2^o : so Hex. here ; Ⓢ¹ ' the ship ' ; St. corrects to אניתו, ' his ship ' ; but the evident subject was replaced with this clumsy gloss.—50. או אשר : see Note on בנה 9, 24. אהזיהו.—Ⓢ¹ (16^{28g}) ' the king of Israel,' but Ⓢ = Ch., and there is no reason, with St., to correct the text ; Ⓢ there omitted the name, as Ahaziah had not yet been formally introduced.—באניית : = Ⓢ², but Ⓢ as sing. ; with St. the generic pl. is proper here.—51. ויקבר עם אבתיו. Ⓢ¹ om.

I. 22⁵²—II. 1. The reign of Ahaziah of Israel. Cf. *Ant.*, ix, 2. Apart from the usual initial and concluding formulas, and a memorandum of the rebellion of Moab, the section consists of a prophetic story telling of the illness and death of the king, II. 1. 1. *And Moab rebelled against Israel after Ahab's death.* Opinions vary much as to the origin of this brief note. Some (*e.g.*, Kittel, Benzinger) regard it as fragment of an original record, which has been suppressed as repetitive of the history in 3^{4ff.} Stade, Šanda find it editorial, giving an instance of divine judgment. It is best to understand it as an editorial note, defining the king by name in the story in ch. 3, which records that " when Ahab was dead, the king of Moab rebelled against the king of Israel " (v.⁵). For the historical data see Comm. on that passage.

The story of Elijah's part is distinct from all the rest of the Elijah cycle in the preposterousness of the miraculous element, and in its inhumanity with the destruction of the innocent fifties ; it is quite in humour with the Elisha cycle. Only the introductory details of Ahaziah's illness with the mission to Baal-zebul of Philistine Ekron and the description of Elijah's garb present any historical colouring. Benzinger regards vv.⁵⁻¹⁶ with the miracle-story as secondary amplification ; Kittel follows in like strain, accepting vv.²⁻⁸. 17a, according to which the king inquired who the messenger of doom was, and after identifying him he soon expired. But there are no literary criteria to support such criticism ; as Šanda remarks, " the hypothesis of a late interpolation has not much utility." The story with its repetitiousness, after good Oriental style, has given rise to many variations and additions in the Greek,

while the Hebrew text has suffered minor changes (see Notes).

2. *And Ahaziah fell down through the lattice in his upper-story (sc. of the palace) that was in Samaria.* This passage and 9^{30ff.}, how Jezebel "looked down through the window," illustrate the peculiar Syrian construction with upper story and open platforms known to the Assyrians as *bît hillâni*, the latter word=Heb. *hillôn*, 'window'; see Lexx., and Dussaud, *Syria*, 1935, 349 ff., with architectural reconstructions. The sick king sent messengers to *inquire of Baal-zebul the god of Ekron, whether I shall recover from this sickness of mine?* The element *zebûb* means 'flies,' and so the Grr. here in general and Jos., *μύιαν*, and such has been the general acceptance, with parallels from ancient cults of fly-gods, as apotropaic to the scourge, e.g., *Ζεὺς ἀπόμυιος* and the 'Myiagrus deus Romanorum.' See in particular J. Selden, *De dis Syris*, 301 ff., with abundant classical and patristic references; also Keil, *ad loc.*, L. B. Paton, *ERE* 'Baal.' But in the N.T. (Mt. 10²⁵, 12²⁴, Mk. 3²², Luke 11^{15ff.}) the best texts, including the Chester Beatty papyri, present the rdg. 'Beelzebul,' as against 'Beelzebub'; and the former was here the rdg. of Sym. acc. to Gr. MSS j z. That such was the original rdg. has been held by Scaliger, Selden, Grotius, and more recently by Cheyne (*EB s.v.*), Lagrange, *Études sur les religions sémitiques*², 1905, 84, and Šanda; others, e.g., Kittel, Stade, deny it. J. Lightfoot (on Mt. 12²⁴) argued that *zebûb* was played upon with *zebûl*, and so equal to Heb. *zèbel*, 'dung'; but the name should then have become 'Baalzebel,' like Jezebel's name (I. 16³¹); see Note there on that name. The present deity's name meant 'Baal Prince.' Why this deity of Ekron,¹ one of the cities of the old Philistine pentapolis, was supplicated by the Israelite king is obscure; the ancient gods had their specialties and fashions. Notable in the present story, which appears so apocryphal, are these data of original local colour. 3. The term, *the angel of YHWH*, appears in the Elijah cycle only here, I. 19⁷, and at v. 15; elsewhere YHWH speaks to him, or the word of YHWH comes to him. The present term

¹ For its location as at modern 'Āḳir see Abel, *GP* 2, 319; but Albr. identifies it with Ḳatra, assuming shifting of the name, *AASOR* 2-3 (1922), 1 ff.

appears again in 19³⁵. For this figure, in addition to the BDD and Biblical Theologies, see the study by A. Lods, "L'ange de Yahvé et 'l'âme extérieure,'" *ZAW*, Beih. 27 (1914), 263 ff. The expression, *king of Samaria*, appears contemptuous. **8.** The description of the unrecognized seer as *a certain possessor of hair* (so the Heb.) has been interpreted in two ways: as a *hairy man*, and so the Jewish tradition, the Grr., $\text{Ⲫ} (\text{Ⲛ} \text{Ⲫ} \text{ tr. literally})$, EVV, Chic. B.; or as *a man with a hairy garment*, and so GV FV, Renaissance scholars in Poole, margin of RVV, Moffatt. Modern commentators generally accept the latter interpretation and with right. John the Baptist's garb of camel's hair and a leathern girdle (Mt. 3⁴) in imitation of his forerunner is sufficient commentary on the phrase. The garb was not one of simplicity but of professional austerity; similarly Samuel's ghost was recognized by the mantle (1 Sam. 28¹⁴); Elijah's power was evidenced and transferred by means of his mantle (2⁸. 13^{ff.}); false prophets "wore the hairy mantle for deception" (Zec. 13⁴). It was indeed an ascetic costume, one still continued by the Muslim Sufis; see Montgomery, 'Ascetic Strains in Early Judaism,' *JBL* 51 (1932), especially p. 201, and P. Joüon, 'Le costume d'Élie,' etc., *Biblica*, 1935, 74 ff.; also for modern usage cf. Dalman, *A. u. S.*, 5, 18, 165, etc. **9.** *Captain of fifty*: is identical with Akk. *rab hanšá*, and was an honourable title, cf. Is. 3³; for the most recent discussion of the numeral term (Ex. 13¹⁸, etc.) see H. W. Glidden, *JAOS* 56 (1936), 88 ff. In the repeated stories of the expeditions to arrest the prophet there is subtle progress. In v.⁹ the officer announces that *the king has said [dibber], Come down!*; in v.¹¹ the command is imperious, *the king has commanded [āmar], Come down quickly!* Also the first officer goes up on the hill (v.⁹), the second evidently summons at a distance (v.¹¹), while the third approaches the prophet with personal supplication (v.¹³). **13.** Omit as superfluous *the third captain of fifty*. The phrase, *may my life be precious . . . in thy eyes*, corresponds to Akk. *napišti ina pānika liḫir* (see Haupt, Šanda). **16.** Omit with OGr., *is it because there is no God in Israel for seeking after his word*, an intrusion from v.³.

VV.¹⁷.¹⁸ present a strange complex in the Heb., while the Grr. add to the complication. The passage also parallels 3¹,

but with chronological contradiction. The following attempts a critical presentation of the text. 17^a. *And he died according to the word of YHWH which Elijah spoke.* 17^b. *And Jehoram 'his brother' [plus with Theod. (see Field), G^L S V; 3 Heb. MSS + his son] reigned in his stead, 17^c. 'in year two of Jehoram ben Jehoshaphat king of Judah' [OGrr. om.], 17^d. *for he had no son.* 18. *And the rest of the acts of Ahaziah, etc.* The addition of 'his brother' has generally approved itself as essential in connexion with v.^d; the Heb. 'hyw, 'his brother,' would have been lost by homoiotel. before thtyw, 'in his stead.' However the writer may have assumed the general knowledge that the two princes were brothers. G transferred v.¹⁸ after v.^{17a} to obtain customary order. The intrusion of v.^c was due to the concern for giving a regnal dating to II. 2, the events of which must forsooth have happened after Ahaziah's death. But the Hebrew interpolator has followed an independent chronology and contradicted the datum of 3¹, which dates the accession in year 18 of Jehoshaphat. G has further enlarged the passage after v.¹⁸ with a transcription of 3¹, "And Joram b. Ahab reigned over Israel in Samaria 12 years, becoming king in the eighteenth year of Jehoshaphat king of Judah." G^L has then for economy's sake omitted most of this regnal datum in 3¹. Further the OGrr. have continued here with repetition of 3²⁻³. Benzinger, Stade, Šanda, Olmstead (*AJSJL* 31, 178 f.) prefer the Greek text as preserving the original here; Kittel takes the opposite position, and the present writer agrees with him. The Greek arrangement as formally more correct was the result of editing.*

52. G^L has a different order of statement, commencing with the accession date, which St. prefers as the usual form; but G^L has simply regularized the present form, which appears above, 15²⁵. Initial 'and' might be expected, with G, but G^L = H.—53. אנו : Grr. (exc. u) + 'Jezebel.'—54. את הנעל וישתחוה לו : Grr. treat the objects as pl.—*Ad fin.* Gr. B G^L C add II. 1¹, following an editorial usage in B C of making liaison between the two halves of a book, e.g., at end of 1 Sam., 1 Ch. (see Burn.).

II. 1. 2. ארויה : by general use reducing the full spelling in such names after the first instance (*cf.* II. 22⁵²), which many MSS have also here.—שבכה : in 7^{17a}. of architectural network, here 'lattice,' *cf.* Arab. *šubbāk* (Šanda); Jos. understands it as of a staircase from the roof.—אלהי : G^L with doublet, *προσοχθισμα*; *cf.*

Rahlfs, SS 3, 194 f.—עָקְרוֹן: Grr., *Ακκαρων* (N *Αγκαρων*, cf. Akk. *Amkaruna*), פֶּ' 'Accaron'; the developed second vowel is taken by some (e.g., Dölller, Šanda) as original; but old as this vocalization was, it was a secondary vowel-development, effected by the liquid; see the writer's Note on 'Alleged Intensive Formations,' *JAOS* 46 (1926), 56 ff.—קָהֵלִי: Grr. tr. with 'from my sickness,' and so for קָהֵלִי Jer. 10¹⁹, with 'my sickness'; accordingly St., *BH* correct to קָהֵלִי; but there may be here survival of the older form in *-ya*, i.e., *hōliya*, as in Arab. in similar contact.—For unarticulated קָהֵלִי (also v.⁸) see GK §126, y.—*Ad. fin.* OGrr+ "and they went to inquire through him."—3. אֵלֶיהָ: so vv.^{4, 8}, but otherwise in the ch. אֵלֶיהוּ, and so MSS here and v.⁸; 6 6^H corroborate the fuller form as original; the shorter form appears elsewhere only in Mal. 3²³; there is no reason to find in the shorter spelling basis for criticism, with Kit., Sk.—מְבַלֵּי אֵין: for the double negative see GK §152, y. אֵלֶיהֶם: 6^H om.; 6^L texts, 'god or prophet,' or 'prophet' simply.—4. וּלְכָן: the conjunction supported by Grr., needs not to be elided (so St., *vs.* Benz., Šanda), although in vv.^{8, 18} it is lacking. For the adv. 6 6^H *οὐχ οὐτως*, 6^L *δια τούτου*=Aq., Sym., and so respectively below.—*Ad. fin.* Grr.+ "and spoke to them" (Lagarde's text is to be corrected).—6. שָׁלַח: Grr. as הִלַּךְ.—*Ad. fin.* 6^L a long passage imitating I. 14¹⁰, with 'Ahab' replacing 'Jeroboam.'—7. מִשְׁשָׁ: Engl. 'fashion,' as at I. 6³⁸.—9. הָהָה: see Note, 21¹⁸.—10. אֵין [אֵין]: 8 MSS om.=6 6^H פֶּ'; at v.¹³ אֵין, where 6^L=וָאֵין.—11. תָּרַד אֵשׁ מִן הַשָּׁמַיִם וְתָאֵבֵל: the literal Gr. tr. is cited in Rev. 20⁹; but an independent tr. in Luke 9⁶⁴, with inf. *αναλωσαι* for the second verb.—12. וַיִּעַן וַיִּדְבֵּר: a usual phrase even without preceding conversation; cf. Dt. 21⁷, 1 Sam. 9¹⁷, etc., and the use frequent in N.T. 6^L has for וַיִּעַן κ. *απεβη*, which, as=וַיִּעַן, is accepted by Benz., Kit. (not *BH*), Šanda; St. rejects the word in either tradition.—13. וַיִּדְבֵּר: Or. MSS וַיִּדְבֵּר.—אֵלֶיהֶם: read with 3 MSS deR., אֵלֶיהֶם=Grr., 6; 6^H om. [אֵין] הָאֵלֶיהֶם: read אֵלֶיהֶם, with MSS, as at v.¹⁰, and so here Gr. MSS B i.—[אֵין] אֵלֶיהֶם: om. with 11 MSS deR., Grr., 6 6^H 6^L.—14. שְׁלִישִׁים: B *ηγουμενον*=שְׁלִישִׁים, then ignoring foll. שֵׁר הָהָה as superfluous; *al.* Grr., *τριτον*=6^H=שְׁלִישִׁים, 'a third,' generally accepted by critics (St. regarding it as scribal expansion); 'a third time' of 6^H is out of question. But in support of 6^H, 'a third set of messengers,' cf. 1 Sam. 19²¹ (Burn.).—וַיִּעַן: OGrr., 6^H om., and so St. decides; but the approach to the person is to the point.—שֵׁר הַרְשָׁשִׁים הַשְּׁלִישִׁים: 6^H avoids this unnecessary repetition of the subject, 6^L om. 'the third.'—15. הָרִאשִׁיִּים: =Grr., although asterisked by 6^H as from the Three.—אֵתֵי אֵתֵי *bis*: many MSS אֵתֵי, and some presenting the Kr. אֵתֵי (deR.), which must be read.—17. אֵלֶיהוּ: 1 MS om.; 1 MS אֵלֵי, MSS 178, 234 בְּיַד אֵלֵי, =MS g *εν χειρι Ηλιου*.—For further criticism of the text see Comm. For the *pisḥah*-in-middle-of-v. see Note, I. 13²⁰.—18. אֵשׁ: 7 MSS deR. pref. וְכֵל=6^L; see Note, I. 16⁷.

Ch. 2. Elijah's ascension to heaven in a whirlwind: the endowment of Elisha with an extraordinary share of his spirit; Elisha's operation of three miracles with the power of his master. Josephus (*Ant.*, ix, 2, 2) only notes that at this time "Elijah disappeared from men, and none knows to this day of his end," and so he is to be ranked with Enoch. Legend thus early enveloped Elijah not only with the miraculous but also with the mythical. His command over the fire from heaven (I. 18, II. 1) is climaxed here by his ascent in a fiery chariot with fiery steeds. This dominant feature links up, as Kittel observes at length, with the myth of the horses of the sun (*e.g.*, 23¹¹) and ancient widespread sun-myths. And in the dominant Jewish legend, which left Enoch as a subject for sectaries, Elijah came to be ranked with Moses, "whose tomb (also) no man knoweth unto this day," and he became the Haggadic counterpart of the Lawgiver. The early development of this hagiology, occurring first in Mal. 3^{23f.} (EVV 4^{5f.}), appears full-blown in the N.T.; Elijah accompanies Moses in the scene of the transfiguration of Jesus (Mt. 17, Mk. 9, Luke 9), and there is the frequently expressed query as to Jesus' identity with Elijah (Mt. 11¹⁴, etc.), although Jesus found the prophecy fulfilled in John the Baptist (Mt. 17¹², Mk. 9¹³). With this chapter properly begins the Elisha cycle; that prophet has appeared before only in the story of his call (I. 19^{15ff.}).

VV.¹⁻¹². The ascension of Elijah to heaven. The start of Elijah's mysterious journey with his faithful disciple, who had some uncanny inkling of the coming event, was made *from Gilgal*, from which place *they went down to Bethel* (vv.¹⁻²). The earlier commentators identified Gilgal with the place on the Jordan recorded in Jos. 4^{19ff.}, 5^{9ff.}, an identification patently absurd. Thenius was the first to correct this notion, followed by Keil at length, these scholars identifying the place with Jiljiliya (possibly the Gilgal of Dt. 11³⁰), lying between Bethel and Shiloh (see Döllner, *GES* 242; Abel, *GP* 2, 337). But this site lies lower than Bethel (774 m. *vs.* 881 m.), and so *went down to Bethel* is inaccurate. Sanda notes the rdg. of the Gr., 'they came,' and desires so to revise the Heb., but the Gr. is itself probably an intentional correction; the verb may have been used from the writer's geographical

standpoint. Gilgal appears as one of Elisha's centres (4³⁸), but later still is excoriated as a heathenish sanctuary by Amos (4⁴, 5⁵) and by Hosea (4¹⁵, 9¹⁵, 12¹²). The legend knows of a large school of prophets at Bethel (v.³), and of another at Jericho (v.⁵), of which some fifty members are numbered (v.⁷). These seers know what is to happen, and Elisha reveals that he also is in the mysterious secret. The cleaving of the waters of Jordan by the stroke of Elijah's power-endowed mantle (v.⁸—see Comm., 1⁸) reproduces the miracles of Moses and Joshua at the Red Sea and the Jordan. The *double portion of thy spirit*, for which Elisha asks (v.⁹), is phrased after the legal terms for the prerogative in legacy to the eldest son (Dt. 21¹⁷), as recognized early by Grotius and others. Elijah's response (v. 10) leaves the gratification of the disciple's desire to the divine will; the latter must be found worthy of the sight of the *mysterium*; cf. 6¹⁷, Luke 24¹⁶⁻³¹. Elisha's cry after his departing master (v.¹²), *My father, my father, Israel's chariotry and horses!*, is one almost of despair, for Elijah was worth a whole fighting-arm to Israel. The same cry is put in the mouth of king Joash at the death-bed of Elisha (13¹⁴). For 'father' as a religious title cf. 8⁹.

VV.¹³⁻¹⁴. Elisha's return and repetition of his master's miracle at the Jordan. The theme of the mantle parallels the incident at I. 19¹⁹. **14.** *And he took Elijah's mantle that had fallen off from him*: repetitive of v.¹³, but with a different leading verb, there *he took up*. *And he smote the waters*, repeated: the repetition to be kept as emphatic (cf. Stade). See Note for intrusion in Greek and Latin MSS of an exegetical statement after the first case to the effect that the waters were not divided. Elisha not only uses the magical garment, but also invokes the divine Name: *Where Is YHWH, the God of Elijah, even He?* The emphatic pronoun is in line with the divine "I am He" of Second Isaiah, etc. The EVV, Chic. B., following tradition, paraphrase here with "and when he (Elisha) also had smitten." See Note for the much vexed phrase.

VV.¹⁵⁻¹⁸. Despite Elisha's protest there follows the search by fifty athletes of the guild for the departed master. In v.¹⁶ *the spirit* [Heb. *rûh*, primarily 'wind, breath'] of YHWH, which may have taken him up, is thought of quite physically

and identified with the whirlwind; *cf.* the similar energy of the divine spirit in Gen. 1². See Note further, and for the subject at large Volz, *Der Geist Gottes*, and *Das dämonische in Yahwe* (1924).

VV.¹⁹⁻²². The healing of the abortion-producing spring at Jericho. The site is identified by v.¹⁸, *he was staying in Jericho*. The spring has been identified with 'Ain es-Sultān, near Jericho, the Elisha's Spring of Christian tradition. There is inexact parallelism in the statements of the noxious character of the waters: v.¹⁹ reads: *the waters are bitter, and the land is miscarrying*, but v.²¹: *there shall not be thence any more death and miscarrying* (*sc.* 'woman,' with the fem. ppl.). The problem arises as to mng. of 'the land'; if used in the primary sense, infertility must be meant, and so AV, 'casting of fruit'; but the Heb. verb is used (as the Grr. recognized) only of human infertility or destruction of babes. Accordingly the word is to be understood in the sense of the people of the land (*cf.* Gen. 11¹), with Thenius, *al.*, *i.e.*, human barrenness is meant. For such an effect of certain waters on women *cf.* the water of jealousy in Num. 5^{11ff.}. In v.²¹ with slight change of pointing replace the ppl. with a differently vocalized noun = 'miscarriage,' and so as a noun RVV JV, 'miscarrying.' For further discussion see Note (at v.¹⁹). For the hygienic use of salt in Jewish and Palestinian lore see I. Löw, 'Das Salz,' in the G. A. Kohut Volume, 429 ff. It is remarkable that such an ample source of water as this spring should have become invested with a legend of so late a person as Elisha; in the original story there may have been no geographical identification.

VV.²³⁻²⁵. The awful penalty on the little boys who mocked the prophet. The story reads like a *Bubenmärchen* to frighten the young into respect for their reverend elders. Very suggestive is Stade's suggestion (*ZAW* 1894, 307), followed by Šanda, but rejected by Kittel, that some shaving of the head, tonsure (so Šanda) was one of the distinguishing marks of the prophet's order; for Elisha was not an old man, and natural baldness is infrequent in the open life of the East. The prohibition of cutting the hair for the dead (Dt. 14¹) would have had no application to the ascetic habit. See Macalister, *DB*, 'Baldness' (with classical references to reproach of baldness), Ball,

EB 973 f. The bear (*Ursus syriacus*), now confined to the wilder parts of the Lebanon, was common in ancient Palestine, and appears in the Bible as a peculiarly fierce animal, paired with lion and leopard (e.g., Hos. 13⁷⁻⁸), which trait is corroborated by Ūsāma ibn Munḵidh (12th century) in his hunting experiences;¹ for Biblical references see BDD. The very exact figure, *forty-two*, for the unfortunate children, adds realism to the story; but for the figure as one of ill omen cf. 10¹⁴, and Rev. 11², 13⁵. The appended itinerary for Elisha: *And he went thence to Mount Carmel, and thence he returned to Samaria*, appears to have little motive, unless Carmel is cited as a well-known pilgrimage objective of pious men. There is no reason, with Wellhausen, to amend 'Carmel' to 'Gilgal'; Elisha had his fixed home in Samaria (5³, 6^{20a}).

1. יהוה: B j o *theos*.—בטעיה: for variations in K_r. see Ginsb.¹⁻², and SBOT, Haupt requiring בָּטָא: the root-spelling is variant of טעיר.—הזמנים: Ⓞ ω s ε ι s τ. οὐρανόν, with theological caution (cf. Jos.): this is repeated in v.¹¹.—הנגל: B Ⓞ 'Jericho.'—2. וירדו: B A Ⓞ as sing.—3. [אל]: בית: locative; 19 MSS deR., Sebīr, בבית.—4. [ויאמר] לו אליהו אלישע: 3 MSS om. אלישע, cf. v.⁶; Ⓞ Ⓞ Ⓞ = אליהו אל אלישע, with misunderstanding of the vocative.—7. הלכו: Ⓞ Ⓞ ignore as repetitive of v.⁵.—נגוד מרהוק: cf. v.¹⁵, 3²²; Joüon, RB 15, 405 ff., takes עמד נגוד as always 'to stand at a distance,' with מרהוק here as further interpretative; similarly Smend on Ben Sira, 37⁴.—8. יגלם: the root, 'to roll up,' also LHeb.—9. בעברם: correct, vs. בע' of MSS, edd.; the same variation at 3⁵.—ויהי: Ⓞ = יהי, but rdg. ויהי for יהי, v.¹⁰.—10. לָקַח: for Pual ppl. minus preformative see GK §52, s; Bergstr., HG 2, 17 f., *inf.*, denies such cases, but does not list the present case; BL §45, ignores these phenomena.—11. כושי: B s as sing.—יפרו: OGrr. as sing.—ויעל: Grr., κ. ἀνελημφθη=Mk. 16¹⁹.—12. פרישיו: Grr. as sing., ἄππευs, which Ⓞ follows with 'auriga'; St. prefers the sing., making Elijah the charioteer; but פ' has never this mng.—14. St. elides the repetitious בעליו בעלה; BH regards בעליו . . . ויקח as 'prob. addition'; but repetition is characteristic of story.—ויהי bis: the uncontracted form, as also at v.⁸, 8²¹.—10 ויכה את הזמנים: all Gr. MSS, except remarkably B A, with plus, "and it was not divided"; this was taken over into many Latin MSS and the Clementine Vulgate; see Tischendorf's ed., and Rahlfs's full

¹ For this delightful autobiography of a Muslim knight see H. Derenbourg's extensive publication in three volumes, text, translation, historical survey (1889-95), and P. K. Hitti, translation, *An Arab-Syrian Gentleman* (1929), and text from the original MS (volume wholly in Arabic, Princeton Univ. Press, 1930).

discussion, SS 3, 268 ff.—אף הוא : אף attaches to the foll. sentence, as 'also he,' *i.e.*, Elisha, and so Jewish comm., *e.g.*, Rashi, and so EVV paraphrase, "and when he also had smitten"; GV ignores. Aq., *καίπερ αυτος*, *cf.* FV 'l'Éternel même,' and so Keil as emphatic apposition. Sym., *και νυν* = 𐤒 'etiam nunc,' as rdg. אפיא (*e.g.*, 10¹⁰), and this accepted by Then., Benz., Kit., Sk., and by Burn, with query. Grätz, Perles propose *הוא איפה*, "where is he?" (*cf.* Gen. 37¹⁶); but this only repeats the first query. St., followed by Šanda, Eissf., regards the phrase as gloss to *ויכה* 1⁰, making parallelism with Elijah's previous action, but fallen into the wrong place. The Grr., other than Aq., Sym., transliterate with *αφφω* (= 𐤒^H), which was treated as a mystical word by the Church Fathers; see Field, *ad loc.*—15. *ויראו* 3 MSS = 𐤒^L 𐤒. אשר ביריחו—: as the group is the 50 prophets of v.7, the phrase is elided by many comm.; but even if careless, it may well be original, with Šanda.—*גיה רוח אליהו*: 'spirit' here, as human, is fem. with original gender, but 'the spirit of YHWH,' v.16, is masc., as divine, *cf.* I. 22²¹; this by the theological development, although 'the spirit of God' is fem. in Gen. 1². There arose confusion of genders; in Ps. 51 the suppliant's spirit is masc. in v.12, but fem. in v.19. In Arabic the same noun is masc., when used of celestial beings (Wright, *Arab. Gr.*, I, 182). In the Syriac Church the 'Holy Spirit' was masculinized. Syr. *ܢܦܠ* is masc., when used for 'person.'—16. *רוח*: St. deletes, as taken from I. 18¹², 22²⁴.—*הניאות*: Kt. = 𐤒^L 𐤒, which is strictly correct; Kṛ. 𐤒^L 𐤒.—17. *ניצחו*: 2 MSS = 𐤒^L 𐤒; *cf.* I. 21²⁰.—19. *העיר*: 𐤒^L 𐤒 𐤒 'this city.'—*האריץ*: 𐤒^L simplified by omitting the noun and making the ppl. refer to the waters, *ατεκνονντα*; the other Grr. understood 'ט' in its primary sense of the Kṛ *ατεκνονμενη*. In v.21 𐤒 translates exactly with *θανατος κ. ατεκν.*; 𐤒^L tried to improve with distinction of genders, *αποθνησκαω κ. ατεκν.* The ppl. 𐤒^L 𐤒 is to be read as nominal, 𐤒^L 𐤒, 'miscarriage'; a causative mng. of the verb in sense of causing abortion is not elsewhere found, so as to allow that sense in v.19. See Haupt's lengthy but uncertain note.—20. *צלחיה*: the form only in Aram. dialects, otherwise *צלחה*; for the vessel see Honeyman's study, p. 87.—21. *רפאתי* BH, *רפאתי* Bär, Ginsb.: in v.22 the verb is treated as ל"ה.—60 MSS, edd., = 𐤒^L 𐤒 𐤒.—22. *וירפו*: Kṛ. 𐤒^L 𐤒 and so MSS Kt.—23. *ויתקלו*: 𐤒^L with a doublet, 'and stoned him' = 𐤒, rendering of a perverted rdg., *ויבקלו* (Klost.).—2⁰ קרה.—𐤒 om., and so St approves; 1 MS Ken. om. *עלה קרה* 2⁰.—24. *אחריו*: 𐤒 'after them.'

3¹⁻³. The accession and character of Jehoram king of Israel. A modification is made in the condemnation of this Northern king, the last of his line, to the effect that *he did what was evil in the eyes of YHWH, only not like his father and mother; and he removed the Baal-pillar that his father had made. But*

to the *sin* [sing. with Grr., vs. \mathfrak{H} , as demanded by the following pron. suffix form] of Jeroboam ben Nebat, who brought guilt upon Israel, did he cleave, not turning away from it. Cf. the similar leniency of judgment upon the last king, Hosea (17²); but the original guilt of Jeroboam was entailed to its bitter end upon the North. The 'Baal-pillar' (which is pluralized in $\mathfrak{S}^{\text{H}} \mathfrak{P}$) may possibly be translated 'Baal-image,' following the interpretation by Dhorme (*L'Évolution religieuse d'Israël*, 1, 161 ff.); he identifies the Heb. *maṣṣēbāh* with the related word *nēṣīb*, appearing in Old Aramaic inscriptions with mng. of 'image,' namely one on a colossal statue of the god Hadad, registering 'this statue of Hadad,' and another on a statue erected by the dedicator to the memory of his father; see the Hadad inscr., lines 1, 14, the Panammuwa inscr., line 1. The same phrase occurs in 10²⁷. See Cooke, *NSI* 103, for a study of the widespread word.

VV.⁴⁻²⁷. The war of the kings of Israel, Judah, and Edom against Mesha king of Moab; their successful incursion into the south of Moab, and siege of Kerak, but their subsequent panic and retreat by reason of Mesha's dread sacrifice. Cf. *Ant.*, ix, 3. The narrative is a capital example of a 'prophetic' popular story of an actual historical event, supplemented by the unique Hebraic stele of the Moabite Mesha.¹ The pertinent part of the inscription relates as follows (lines 4 ff.): "Omri king of Israel afflicted Moab many days, because Chemosh was angry with his land. And his son succeeded him, and he too said: I will afflict Moab in my days. He said [understand 'so'?). And I gazed upon him [*i.e.*, in triumph, cf. Ps. 118⁷] and upon his house. And Israel perished

¹ Discovered by the Rev. F. Klein, Aug. 19, 1868 at Daibon (so Gr. *Δαίβων*=Mesha's spelling, vs. Biblical, *Dibon*), and now in the Louvre. For reproductions and interpretation see Dr., *Samuel*, App., pp. lxxxiv, seq., and *EB s.v.* 'Mesha'; Lidzb., *HNE* 415 ff.; *Eph.*, 1, 1 ff., 143 ff., 278 ff.; *AT* 5 ff.; W. H. Bennet, *DB s.v.* 'Moab'; D. Sidersky, *La stèle de Méša* (*Rev. Archéologique*, 1920), with history of the discovery and full bibliography; also the *Biblical Archaeologies*, e.g., Barton, *AB* 460 ff. See the *Histories of Kittel* (*GVI* 2, 258 f.), Cook (*CAH* 3, 372 ff.), Robinson (*HI* 253 ff.), Olmstead (*HPS* 388 ff.), Meyer (*GA* 2, 2, 326 ff.), Winckler (*KAT* 253 f.) takes a contrary view of the geography involved. For a brief discussion of the history see Burrows, *WMTS* 274 f.

everlastingly. And Omri (had) possessed the land of Mhdb' (Bibl. Medebah, Is. 15², etc.), and he dwelt in it for his days and [a broken construction] half of the days of his son [the pl. is possible, the name(s) being ignored], forty years. And Chemosh restored it in my days. And I built Baal-meon," etc. Olmstead places the erection of the stele before the allies' invasion, and so explains the circuitous route to the south to avoid the freshly fortified cities of Mesha's construction, all N of the Arnon; but it is preferable to reverse the order of events, with Kittel, Meyer, Lidzbarski, the last-named scholar interpreting 'the everlasting perishing of Israel' as referring to the annihilation of the dynasty by Jehu (842 B.C.). The figure '40 years' is a round number, expressing a generation, as frequently in the Bible, and *cf.* the regnal terms ascribed to David and Solomon. For attempts at figuration of the dates see Cooke, p. 9. Omri reigned 18 years, Ahab 22; but we do not know when Omri's control began, nor is the latter's successor evident by name in the inscription. There is no reason to dispute the datum of the Judæan king as Jehoshaphat, which Lucian changed to 'Ahaziah' to suit his varying chronology.²

4. *And Mesha king of Moab being sheeppmaster* —. The latter noun, *nôkēd*, occurs elsewhere in the O.T. only in Amos 1¹, describing the prophet as one of 'the sheeppmasters of Tekoa' (the noun being generally mistranslated in EVV). It appears now in an Ugaritic text, in the colophon to the first published long composition (*Syria*, 1934, 226 ff.; Gordon, *Ugar. Handbook*, 2, 62: 54 f.), entitling the dictator of the text as *rb khnm rb nkdm*, 'chief priest, chief sheeppmaster'; the term was thus official, *i.e.*, royal sheeppmaster, like 'chief butler,' 'chief baker' in Gen. 40². *Cf.* also Akk. *ruhu šarri*, 'king's shepherd,' for which see Note, I. 4⁵. — *he used to render to the king of Israel a hundred thousand lambs and the wool of a hundred thousand rams, i.e.*, as the Heb. iterative form suggests,

² In vv. 7. ⁹; in v. 12 omission of 'Jehoshaphat,' naming the 'king of Judah,' *bis*. The several essential corrections proposed by St. (*cf.* BH 'fortasse') are all based on Lucian, along with arbitrary elision of 'Joram,' v. 6, in which case the Northern king's name would have been entirely ignored in this Northern document. See Rahlfs's discussion of Lucian's chronology, SS 3, 270 ff.

annually. Is. 16¹, in the oracle against Moab, has been compared for the tribute of lambs (see EVV), but the text is hopeless (see Gray, *ad loc.*). R^VV^{ms}, J^V, Chic. B., Moffatt make the tribute to consist in both lambs' and rams' wool, but the Heb. hardly admits this, while the ancient wool was drawn from rams, not lambs. 5. *And it came about, when Ahab died, that the king of Moab rebelled against the king of Israel.* 6. *And king Jehoram went forth on that day (=at once) from Samaria, and mustered all Israel.* 7. *And he proceeded [Heb. went] and sent message to Jehoshaphat king of Judah, as follows: The king of Moab has rebelled against me. Wilt thou go with me against Moab to battle? And he said: I will go up (the phrase is military); as thou so I, as thy people so my people, as thy horses so my horses.* 8. *And he said: Which way shall we go up? And he said: The way of the steppe of Edom.* N.b. the change of *loquiturs* without naming the subjects after good Semitic fashion. 9. *And went the king of Israel and the king of Judah and the king of Edom.* The presence of the last king appears to contradict I. 22⁴⁸, and also 8²⁰ below, according to which Edom rebelled against Judah in the days of Jehoshaphat's successor, and "made a king over themselves." However there may have been at this time a nominal vicegerent of Edom. *And they went a roundabout way of seven days in length; and there was no water for the army or for the beasts that followed them.* The distance may have been reckoned from the meeting-point with the Edomite allies. 10-12. The despair of Jehoram, whose conscience strikes him, showing that the religion of YHWH remained the religion of the North despite all defections; the greater faith of the Southern king: *Is there not here a prophet of YHWH's, by whom to inquire of YHWH?*; the response of one of the Northern courtiers, that *Elisha ben Shaphat is here, who poured water on Elijah's hands*; Jehoshaphat's cheering response that *the word of YHWH is with him*; the concourse of the three kings with Elisha. For the inquiry after such a real prophet cf. I. 22^{5a}. The appearance of Elisha, introduced as the disciple of his well-known master, appears remarkable; but corroboration of the active part taken by prophets in political history, is witnessed to by a Lachish tablet, no. iv.

13. Elisha pertinently castigates the king of Israel; *What*

is there in common between me and thee? Get thee to thy father's prophets and thy mother's prophets. The last phrase is absent in \mathfrak{S} ; if secondary, as is generally accepted, it would have been suggested by I. 18¹⁹. The king's blunt negative, *Not* (a word of this kind)!, was intended to hush the prophet from such ill-omened language; he recognizes that YHWH alone is concerned in the present emergency. **14.** Elisha replies with consistent bluntness, swearing by *YHWH Sebaoth* that *were it not that I give audience to Jehoshaphat king of Judah, I would not look at thee or see thee!* For this reason he relents. **15.** *And now, bring me a minstrel!*—*For it was the case that when the minstrel played, YHWH's hand lighted upon him.* The Heb. syntax, unless corrected, demands such construction of the last sentence. For such excitation of prophets cf. 1 Sam. 10^{5ff.}, and Lucian, *De Dea Syra*, §43: "a multitude of holy men, pipers, flute-players, and Galli, and women frenzied and fanatic"; on the subject see Stade, *Biblische Theologie*, I (1905), §60. Elisha was a typical 'son of the prophets' in contrast to his ascetic master Elijah. **16.** He gives the oracle of YHWH: *EVV Make this valley full of trenches!* But the verb is not imperative, but an infinitive of absolute action, as also in other oracles to Elisha (4¹³, 5¹⁰), and the sentence may be roughly rendered in English with: *A making of this wady trenches upon trenches!* **17.** The trenches were for collection of the coming waters for the parched armies, for without sight of wind and rain *that wady shall be filled with water, and ye shall drink, ye and your flocks and your beasts.* For the wady in question see Robinson, *BR* 3, 555, and the most recent discussion by Glueck, 'The Boundaries of Edom,' *HUCA* II (1936), 148 ff., with extensive comment on this history; he follows his predecessors in identifying the wady with Wady el-Ḥesā; he also cites Musil, *Arabia Petraea*, I, 83, 381, n., who states that the water found in this valley is at times coloured by the red sandstone, so illustrating v.²² below. The *cattle* (Heb. = *flocks/herds*) refers to the food supply, the *beasts* to the luggage animals. **18. 19.** There is little reason to attempt to harmonize the cruel order for the destruction of Edom with the economic exceptions in warfare laid down by Dt. 20^{19f.}; war supersedes all wisdom as well as benevolence even in allegedly Christian nations. *And every choice city:*

a gloss through a double rdg.; see Note. **20.** The event as prophesied *came to pass on the morrow at the offering of the oblation*; the reference is to the morning *minhāh*, celebrated according to the Talmudic tractate *Tamid*, iii, 2, at the first blush of dawn. The morning oblation—here a purely secular note of time—was secondary to that of the afternoon, the *minhāh par excellence*; see Comm. on I. 18³⁶. *And lo, water was coming by the way of Edom, and the land was filled with the water.* The geographical note appears superfluous; there may be a play upon 'Edom' and 'red'; cf. v.²². The phenomenon is that of the *sail*, cloudburst; cf. Josephus, *Ant.*, xiv, 14, 6, for a similar providential water supply for the garrison of Moabite Masada in Herod's time: "God sending them rain in the night, so that their cisterns were filled." For instances of the havoc of the *sail* see the writer's *Arabia and the Bible*, 85 f. November of 1937 was marked by like heavy rains in Syria-Palestine, an official of King Ibn Sa'ūd reporting that at Dumeir, between Damascus and Palmyra, "he saw a flood five meters high, sweeping away everything before it, which forced him to turn back at full speed" (*N.Y. Times*, Nov. 2, 1937). **21.** The verb translated in the EVV with "they gathered"/"they gathered themselves together," simply means "they were called out" to military service. **22.** For the red phenomenon see above on v.¹⁷; Šanda suggests a mirage; cf. also J. Euting's similar experience in a neighbouring region (*Tagbuch einer Reise in Inner-Arabien*, 98). The interpretation of the Moabite mind by popular report was absurd, but history has to record human absurdities. **24.** *And they came to the camp of Israel; and Israel arose, and smote Moab, and they (Moab) fled before them, and they (Israel) went in (sc. the land), smiting Moab as they went.* The last sentence follows the Grr., and in one case the Kt. in part; for the dubious passage see the variant renderings in text and margin of EVV. **25.** The v. describes with hyperbolic gusto the ensuing destruction of *the cities*, the ruin of *every goodly field*, the stoppage of *every water-spring*, the felling of *every goodly tree, until* (with the RVV) *in Kir-hareseth only they left the stones thereof*, and so similarly AV; JV with exegesis, *until there was left only K. with the stones of the wall thereof.* The clumsy Hebrew is simplest improved by omitting the

reference to the stones, reading *until Kir-hareseth* (alone) *was left*, which fortress the invaders now attacked, *and the slingers surrounded it and smote it*. The passage was early a crux to the VSS and Jos., all ignoring the name of the city; the first scholar to recognize it appears to have been Vatablus (*ob.* 1547), from whom it came into the Reformed translations. Kir-hareseth, the Kir-heres of Is. 16¹¹, Jer. 48^{31. 36}, is universally identified with Kerak, the southernmost fortress of Moab, an identification early made by the Targum to Is. 16⁷; it appears to be identical with Kir-Moab of Is. 15¹. For this 'impregnable fortress' (so the Arabic geographers) see Le Strange, *Palestine under the Moslems*, 479; Musil, *Arabia Petraea*, I, 45 ff.; Abel, *GP* 2, 418 ff. Because of its strength and strategic position controlling the route to the Red Sea, the Crusaders made heroic efforts to possess it. **26.** The king of Moab, hard pressed in the siege, attempted *to break through to the king of Edom*. Comm. recognize the evident contradiction with the precision above of the Edomite king as Israel's ally; Kittel tr. with 'against the k. of E.,' as though by a special sortie, and similarly Olmstead; others, *e.g.*, Šanda, Skinner, regard that king as an unwilling ally; but correcting the common confusion in Heb. of 'rm and 'dm (as at I. 11²⁵), it is best to read *the king of Aram*, with 𐤀 and Winckler, and so Eissfeldt. Damascus would have been his natural ally. **27.** The king of Moab sacrifices his first-born son as a holocaust upon the city's wall in view of the besiegers. The parallel to this extreme sacrifice appears in early Israel in the immolation of Jephthah's daughter (Jud. 11^{29ff.}), and it was practised by a later Judæan king, Ahaz (16³); *cf.* Micah's anxious query, "Shall I give my first-born for my transgression?" (6⁷). This awful sacrifice in political and private emergencies was frequent in Phœnicia.³ The effect of such a ritual was still compelling upon the Israelite mind. *And there came great*

³ See Curtius Rufus, *Hist. Alex. Magni*, iv, 3, 15, 23, for the attempt at such an immolation at Nebuchadnezzar's siege of Tyre; for witness from the Neoplatonist Porphyry see Eusebius, *Præp. evang.*, i, 10, 33, 44; iv, 16, 6. *Cf.* Eissf., *Ras Schamra u. Sanchuniathon*, 69 f., and C. Clemen, *Die phön. Religion nach Philo von Byblos* (MVG 42, Heft 3, 1939), for the text of Philo and commentary. For the ancient rite at large, Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, 3, ch. 13, is to be consulted.

wrath upon Israel—so RVV JV=GV; AV . . . *great indignation against Israel*. The primitive implication was early ignored and forgotten; the Grr. have 'great repentance in Israel,' Jerome, following Aquila, 'great indignation in Israel'; FV "they had horror of it." The earliest commentator, Josephus, attributed the effect upon Israel to their 'commiseration' out of 'humanity and piety.' Rashi interpreted the effect upon Israel somewhat obscurely, "because their sins were remembered," and this view was still held by Keil. See Poole for very diverse interpretations of the Renaissance scholars. The word for 'wrath,' with two slight exceptions, is used entirely of Deity. Old English 'dread' might well translate the word, and more objectively 'panic' would best express it. The contrast between panic fear and true religion appears in Ex. 15¹⁶, "terror and fear falleth upon them," and Is. 8¹³, "He be your reverence and He your fear!" The Israelites lost all heart in sight of the gruesome act. It is not at all necessary to assume, with Kittel, Šanda, that 'the wrath of Chemosh' was once in the text, although the superstitious fears of the soldiery must have been much more alive in a land that was not their God's; cf. Jephthah's word to the king of Ammon (Jud. 11²⁴). The tale belongs to the popular prophetic cycle and uses the bald primitive lingo. There is no need to suppose with the last-mentioned scholars elision of the subsequent successful rally that drove off the besiegers; the connecting link was assumed *e silentio*. It is a striking coincidence that Moabite Mesha in his stele uses similar language, "because Chemosh was angry with his land."

1. בשׂוֹן : most Grr. om.—3. בַּחֲמֹשׁ : read with sing. noun, as in similar cases above.—4. מִיֵּשֶׁע : 4 MSS מִיֵּשֶׁע, as in the Mesha stele; name also of a Calebite; the root frequent in S. Arab. names. The Grr. have *Mωσα*, as though rdg. מוֹיֵשֶׁע, and so one Heb. MS; for similar variations cf. מוֹרֵד and מוֹרֵד, Num. 11²⁷, and see Haupt's note there in *SBOT*.—הָיָה נֶקֶד : Β† *μηρωκεθ* for *η ν.*, this error also in \mathfrak{C} texts; transliteration of the noun is kept in other Grr., exc. Aq., *ποιμνιοτροφος*, Sym., *τρεφων βοσκηματα* = \mathfrak{I} 'nutriens oves.'—וְהָיָה : \mathfrak{L} has a doublet. For the legal sense of the verb cf. 17³.—יִשְׂרָאֵל : OGrr. + *εν τη επαναστασει* = \mathfrak{S}^H בַּחֲמֹשׁ ; an \mathfrak{I} text, 'ex subjectione,' doubtless an error for 'in subj.:' these present an original obscure gloss. Prof. A. D. Nock has suggested to the writer as the original noun, *ὑπανάστασις*, 'a rising

up to give another room.' \mathfrak{C} plus a pertinent gloss, 'year by year.'—צנור: apposition of the material; see Dr., *Tenses*, §194.—6. [ישראל]: כל MSS 30, 195, Grr. om. by provincial criticism, as in cases above.—7. וילך: \mathfrak{L} om. as not *à propos*; but the verb means 'to proceed to action.'—[בואב] אל: אל is expected (*cf.* EVV), but \mathfrak{H} is supported by all MSS and by the preps. in \mathfrak{C} and Grr., showing that the confusion of the two was very early.—8. כמוני כמוך: \mathfrak{L} has a doublet.—9. נעלה: B *al.*, \mathfrak{S}^H as sing.—10. אותם: \mathfrak{L} \mathfrak{V} 'us,' as the pronoun expected.—11. יהושפט: \mathfrak{L} 'the king of Judah,' also MSS (*N al.*) with combination of both elements; similar variations *bis* in v.¹², in the second case the change being supported by two Heb. MSS, and to be accepted.—מאחרו: with Kt. of many MSS read מאחר; *cf.* similar errors, vv.¹², 26.—12. וירדו: B A *al.*, \mathfrak{V} as sing., and the like variation in v.¹⁵ for קחו.—13. אל: *cf.* 6²⁷.—14. ויהי: generally corrected, *e.g.*, by Burn., Haupt, *BH* ('fortasse') to ויהי; the apparently dubious syntax led Klost. to suggestion of an extensive lacuna, a rash proposition accepted by Burn.; but \mathfrak{H} is to be maintained: "and it used to be upon the harper harping, then (in a given case) the hand of Y. came upon him."—[י] יר: 22 MSS deR., ויהי= \mathfrak{C} .—15. גשה: abs. inf. as in another oracle to Elisha, 4¹³, and *cf.* הלוק, 5¹⁰; see Ew., *Lehrb.*, §217, a, and Burn.; \mathfrak{C} \mathfrak{S} with correct feeling for the sense have the passive, *vs.* imper. of Grr., \mathfrak{V} EVV; but Jos. renders literally with aor. inf.—16. מתיניבם: \mathfrak{L} παρεμβολαι νμων, as though for מתיניבם, a correction largely accepted, *e.g.*, by Haupt, *cf.* *BH*; however Rahlfs (*SS* 3, 252) properly regards that rdg. as correction from v.⁹.—17. ונקל ואת: for disagreement in gender *cf.* v.²⁶, also the numerous cases cited in GK §145, e.—18. וכל עיר מבתור: a doublet of the prec. phrase, to be omitted with MS 224, OGrr.; the \mathfrak{K} r. of מ' occurs elsewhere only at 19²³.—19. הנאבו: the root appears inappropriate, hence suggested corrections (see *Lexx.*), but Smend has shown that the verb in Ben Sira 13⁵ means 'to suffer damage'; *cf.* also St.—20. מדרך אדום: \mathfrak{L} ἐξ ὁδοῦ τῆς ἐρημοῦ σουδ (σουρ, σουα) ἐξ Ἑδωμ; *cf.* v.⁸.—21. ויצעקו: an extensive doublet in \mathfrak{L} .—מעלה: \mathfrak{L} A *al.*, ἐπαγα, of which εἰπον ω in B N *al.* is corruption.—22. כנגד: see Note, 2¹⁶.—23. כדם: \mathfrak{L} om.—24. הקרב נהרבו: for Hof. inf. abs. with Nif. *cf.* a case, Lev. 19²⁰, on which see Haupt's note in *SBOT*; the Nif. is expected for the inf., but \mathfrak{H} implies alternative rdgs. for the moods. The verb with its unique mng. 'to fight' is denominative from הקרב 'sword'; *cf.* Syr. root חרב for Heb. root נכה in v.²⁴ (Burn.), and similar development of Arab. *ḥaraba* in stems III, VI, X. Grr. tr. with μάχεσθαι to which \mathfrak{L} adds a doublet with ἐρίζεω. For arbitrary corrections see St., and GB s.v. הרב II.—25. ויבו בה: \mathfrak{K} r. ויבו בה, and so Kt. of ca. 35 MSS Ken., deR. (deR. also noting a few MSS rdg. בה for בה, and so \mathfrak{C} \mathfrak{S} tr.); Grr., κ. εἰσπληθον εἰσπορευομενοι= \mathfrak{S}^H \mathfrak{V} ; the Gr. rdg. was correctly accepted at the Renaissance, *e.g.*, by GV FV AV; of EVV JV is alone in retaining

Κr.—25. ער השאיר אבניה בקיר הקרשׁה : the pointing of the sibilant in the last word follows Bär, *al.*; by apparent error Ginsb. and *BH* give הרשׁת ; ⚙ ⚙^H εως του καταλιπειν τ. λιθους τ. τοιχοι καθηρημενους (understanding root חרס) ; ⚙^L pref. κ. εξεσεισαν τ Μωαβ (a gloss variant = Κr. in v.²⁴), then εως του μη καταλιπειν λιθου εν τοιχω τεκτονικης, the last word as tr. from root הרשׁ I, for the similar noun from which root see Ex. 31⁵, 35³³ (*cf.* Rahlfs, SS 3, 244) ; ⚙ “ until there was not left a stone in the city which they did not destroy (= חרס) ” ; similarly ⚙ ; ⚙ “ ita ut muri tantum fictiles (*cf.* ⚙^L) remanerent,” קיר being represented by ‘civitas’ in the next sentence. As noted above, אבניה and the prep. with קיר must be elided to obtain any sense. St. would replace the former with לבדה ‘only.’ ער השאיר is paralleled in יו¹¹, with similar cases in I. יו¹⁸, etc., in which cases the verb has a sing. subj. ; but here a pl. subj. is demanded, and correction is to be made to inf. השאיר (see Burn. at length).—26. ארו : ארו.—ארו : read ארו, and so ⚙, ‘Syriæ.’ יכלו : as sing. in Jos., ⚙^L ⚙^C ⚙^S, by easy variation.—27. לארץ : the VSS, exc. ⚙ ⚙ ⚙^H, as though לארצם (and so EVV), accepted by many critics, but ⚙ is preserved by St., Haupt, *BH* ; for the political term see Comm. I. 4¹⁹.

CC. 4–8¹⁵. The Elisha cycle (with supplement in ch. 9).

4¹⁻⁷. Elisha’s miracle in behalf of a prophet’s widow in distress, effecting an enormous increase of her potful of oil. *Cf. Ant.*, ix, 4, 2. The story is parallel to Elijah’s miracle in I. 17^{8a}. Marriage of the prophets is thus attested, although in general they appear as lodged in ascetic communities. 1. By a play upon *thy servant (my husband)* Jewish tradition (Josephus, ⚙, Rashi, *et al.*) developed ‘thy servant Obadiah’ (‘servant-of-Y.’), with further expansion on the latter’s protection of the prophets (I. 18⁴). The Hebrew law permitted the ‘selling’ of wife and children as chattels for debt (Ex. 21⁷; Am. 2⁶, 8⁶; Is. 50¹), the practice lasting till after the Exile (Neh. 5). In the Code Hammurabi, §117, such servitude might last for only three years. 2. The word translated ‘pot’ is unique ; it may mean only a small unguent vessel ; see Note. For the high value of oil, also a great export commodity from Palestine, see BDD and Archaeologies. 7. Read *pay off thy creditor* in place of *pay thy debt*, as the Κr. points.

VV.⁸⁻³⁷. Elisha as guest of a great lady ; his promise to her of a child ; the birth of the boy ; the latter’s death some years later ; the prophet’s restoration of him to life. (Josephus ignores 4⁸⁻⁶⁷.) The story is a parallel to that of Elijah’s

sojourn at the home of the Sarephthite widow and his resuscitation of her son (I. 17^{8ff.}). There are several correspondences of detail: either prophet is lodged in an *upper chamber*, in each case the prophet resorts to a form of treatment, *stretching* or *bowing* upon the body; the curt statement, *there was no voice and no attention* (v.³¹), repeats I. 18²⁹. In each of the stories the feminine heart is well depicted, in the present case (v.¹⁶) with the woman's fear lest the prophet were deceiving her (*cf.* v.²⁸), in the other with the passionate blame thrown in his face; also in this story there is the woman's true intuition of bringing the prophet himself to her house, not accepting his servant as intermediary (vv.^{25ff.}). The present story is much more elaborate than the other, with more actors and far greater detail, and apart from its literary character, as Kittel remarks, it casts intimate light upon social life in ancient Israel. There is the *great lady* (*cf.* Naaman, 'a great man,' 5¹), quite mistress in her own house (vv.^{8ff.}), who will accept nothing in return for her hospitality to *the divine*, refusing his offer to be her spokesman to the powers that be. Her reply of proud good breeding, *I dwell among my own people* (v.¹³), in modern terms, in her own social circle, reveals the ancient and abiding character of Semitic social life. The eminent place of the great lady in society is finely presented; *cf.* Buhl, *Die sozialen Verhältnisse der Israeliten*, 97 ff.; Nowack, *Arch.*, §27; Benzinger, *Arch.*, §22. But the uncertain equilibrium of that society appears in the supplementary story, 8^{1ff.}. As appropriate to 'a woman's story' we have the detail of *making an upper chamber* and of its essential furniture, *bed, table, stool, lamp* (v.¹⁰—not 'candlestick' with EVV); see Benz., pp. 98 ff., 104 ff., and the pertinent Dictionary articles. VV.^{18. 19}. Lifelike is the story of the lad's running out to play in the harvest field, and natural his outcry upon the sun-stroke, *My head, my head!* *Cf.* the similar catastrophe in the death of Judith's husband (Judith 8^{2t.}). For the current holidays and their celebration, as expressed in the husband's reply to his lady's obscure determination to travel away, that *it is neither new moon nor sabbath*, *cf.* 1 Sam. 20⁵, Amos 8⁵, Hos. 2¹³, Is. 1^{13t.}, and for modern practice in Palestine, Dalman, *A. u. S.*, 3, 12 f. For the sabbath see E. G. Kraeling, 'The Present Status of the

Sabbath Question,' *AJSL* 49 (1933), 218 ff., with full review of preceding studies, and with the conclusion that the sabbath was originally a mundane seventh-day holiday, independent of the moon's phases, like the Roman *nundinæ* (ninth-day holidays), in this agreeing with Meyer, *GA* 2, 2, 318, n. 2. From this story we learn how the sons of the prophets were sought for divine help, a custom universal in the Oriental world, with the excursions to ascetics, monks, muftis, etc. The story is somewhat diffusive and obscure as to actors and action, a characteristic of Semitic style, which leaves much to the picturing of the scene by the hearer or reader, and hence the constant insertion in the Grr. of changes for clarification, which have affected subsequent VSS, as also modern critics; see the Notes. However most critics find a clear narrative with a minimum of correction. 8. For *Shunem* see Comm., I. 1³. 10. *A little chamber on the wall*: so EVV, exc. JV, . . . *on the roof*; the first term is simply *upper-chamber*, as at I. 17¹⁹; the second remains obscure, the Heb. syntax meaning *a wall-chamber*. See Note for various suggestions and the proposition to read, with change of vowel in H , *a cool upper-chamber*. For the low Oriental *table* see A. Macalister, *DB* s.v. 12. *And she stood before him*: yet it was only later (v.¹⁵) that *she stood in the doorway*, and Elisha's indirect conversation with her through Gehazi is puzzling at first sight. But the former phrase is formal, *she presented herself*; cf. the nuances of mng. of the verb 'to come,' vv.^{36r}, 1^o *she came* (on call), 2^o *she came in* (the chamber). The intermediate agency of Gehazi, standing outside, was good manners, for a lady might not easily speak to a man in his chamber. 13. *Thou hast been careful for us with all this care*: so EVV=current English, "You have taken so much care for us." *Is it to speak for thee to the king?*: so the Heb. literally. 14. Gehazi reports to his master her heart's desire: *She hath no son, and her husband is old*. 15. The prophet bids him, *Call her!*, and when he had done so, *she stood in the door*. 16. Elisha addresses her directly: AV *About this season* [with marg. variant] *according to the time of life*; RVV JV *At this season, when the time cometh round* [with variant]. See Note for the complicated phrase, which has been affected by Gen. 18^{10, 14}. *At this season* should be omitted, and, adopting

Skinner's original suggestion, the following phrase is to be understood as meaning 'according to the time of pregnancy,' doubtless a current polite expression. The happy event is foretold sweetly: *Thou shalt embrace a son.* 23. The Heb. word translated by EVV with *it shall be well*, is *Peace!*, a non-committal 'All is well.' 27. *YHWH hath hid it from me, and hath not told me*: but in a subsequent case he has farsight (5²⁶). 29. *If thou meet any man, salute* (Heb. *bless*) *him not*: identical with Jesus' injunction of urgency upon his disciples (Luke 10⁴). The same verb for salutation (*brk*) appears in 10¹⁵. 30. 31. Gehazi proceeds on his bootless errand; but the woman will not leave Elisha. 34. 35. A much more detailed scene of the treatment of the lifeless body is given here than in I. 17²¹. There the action is expressed by "he stretched himself upon the child," here by *he bowed*. This verb is used of ritual prostration in I. 18⁴². The verb gave great trouble to the Gr. translators; see Note for the numerous renderings and for a novel translation based on a transliteration in Lucian. The physical exhaustion of the practitioner is presented by his taking time off to *go back and walk in the house once to and fro*.

VV.³⁸⁻⁴⁴. Elisha's miracles at sessions with the fraternity of prophets. VV.³⁸⁻⁴¹. Elisha's antidote to 'death in the pot.' *The famine being in the land*: the reference appears to be to the seven years' famine reported in ch. 8; either, as Kittel proposes, a lacuna precedes and the famine was stated, or the reference may be an intrusion in the story; the provisioning of a hundred men must always have been a problem. Elisha is represented as on a visitation to the fraternity at Gilgal (*cf.* 2¹), where the brothers were *sitting before him, i.e.*, for instruction; *cf.* 6³². The verb 'to sit' produced the noun *yēšibāh*, 'session, school,' appearing first in Ben Sira, 51²⁹, and remaining still a current technical name in Judaism. These scenes introduce us to an ancient 'vita communis et contemplativa'; *cf.* the writer's article, 'Ascetic Strains in Early Judaism,' *JBL* 51 (1932), 183 ff. That such schools were also studious is proved by the remarkable literature that issued from the prophetic guilds. As head of the order Elisha acted as host. For the command, *Set on the pot*, *cf.* Eze. 24³, with the following lively description of the boiling. For the

wild gourds see Post, *DB* 2, 250, and in particular Dalman, *Sacred Sites and Ways*, 81 f.: “(In the Jordan valley) creeps the coloquintida (*citrullus colocyntis*) with its little leaves and yellow apples, resembling melons, which Elisha’s disciples, who were evidently not natives of the district, wanted to cook as food, but which are only of value as an aperient.” Keil notes that the colocynth eaten in quantity can be fatal, citing Dioscorides, iv, 175. Oesterley and Robinson, *Hebrew Religion*, 89, adjudge the prophet’s operation as a case of imitative, counter-active magic, a dash of good meal obviating the poison. There is to be added the discussion by J. P. Harland of ‘The Apple of Sodom’ in *BA* 1943, 49 ff.

VV.⁴²⁻⁴⁴. A miraculous feeding of the school of prophets. A friend from a distant part brings the prophet a personal gift of barley loaves and grits (see Note) of the first milling of the harvest—so *the first-fruits*, not here a ritual term. *Baal-shalisha* (cf. ‘the land of Shalisha,’ 1 Sam. 9^d), the home of the visitor, was identified by the *Onom.* with *βαυθσαρμισα* (and so the Grr. render here), 22 km. N of Lydda; but the name appears more exactly in that of the neighbouring Kefr Tilt (Arab. *tult* = Heb. *šālīš*, ‘a third’); see Abel, *GP* 2, 259. The prophet contradicts his servant’s natural scepticism as to the sufficiency of food for the party with ‘a word of YHWH’ = Engl. ‘enough and to spare!’ The fraternity is here numbered at a hundred members; cf. the fractional figure, fifty, 27.^{16.17}, and the hundred prophets hidden away by fifties, I. 18^d.

1. מְנַשֵּׁי בָנֵי : 3 MSS om. בָּנֵי ; 1 MS מְנַשֵּׁי = Grr., שֶׁ^H; St. holds מְנַשֵּׁי as superfluous, as did those translators; but cf. Jud. 4^d, דְּבִירָה עִבְרָה—אֵינָה נְבִיאָה 2^o: שֶׁ שֶׁ^H ‘a servant’; שֶׁ^L ‘a servant of the Lord.’—2. אֵלֶיהָ : שֶׁ om. (שֶׁ has).—לְבִי, Kṛ. לָהּ: the Kt. survival of N Israelite dialect; like cases below, vv.^{3. 7. 16. 23}; these with variant manuscript tradition; see deR., Ginsb., and for such dialectic forms Int., §2.—נְבִיאָה 2^o: 2 MSS (50, 70) om., and so B *al.* (not שֶׁ), avoiding the Sem. repetition; again St. finds intrusion.—אָנֹכִי : שֶׁ שֶׁ^H as verbal, ἀλειψομαι (שֶׁ texts with further corruption); שֶׁ^L correctly ἀγγειον = ט שֶׁ (פֶּ ‘a little’); for the unusual development from the root כִּן, ‘to anoint,’ cf. אָנֹיב (Akk. *zūpu*), אָנִיב (Syr. *gūz*). Then. (cf. Burn.) renders ingeniously with ‘an anointing,’ a supply sufficient for one application; for attempts at correction of text see Stade-Haupt. But it doubtless means an ointment pot, with modern trr.; for the most recent study of the word see Honeyman, *PEQ* 1939, 79.—4. עַל (no variant):

Burn. well *cf.* Nah. 3¹² for the use of the prep., and there is no reason, with Grätz, St., to read אַל after Gr. εἰς; the general textual change is in the opposite direction.—כַּל: OGrr. om.—הַלֵּלִים הָאֵלֶּה: 𐤂 plus “and it will not (var., thou shalt not) stay.”—5. בָּאָרוֹ: Gr. MSS q u (Lag. accepts as Lucianic rdg.) plus “and did so,” adopted lightly by Klost., *al.*—מִצְעָקֶת Kt., and so many MSS (6 MSS מִצְעָקֶת: but the 𐤂 in v. 4; St. assumes a Piel ppl., with intensive sense, ‘pouring incessantly.’—6. בָּנָה הַיְיִשָּׁה [אֵל]: the sing. (= 𐤂 𐤂 𐤂), as addressed to the son whose turn it was; the Grr. pluralized, as might be expected.—7. נִשְׁכָּרְךָ: ‘thy debt,’ with use of an otherwise unknown noun; but 𐤂 𐤂 = GV, ‘creditor,’ *i.e.*, as נִשְׁכָּרְךָ, which is preferable; Grr. τ. τὰκοὺς σου, *i.e.* as נִשְׁכָּרְךָ. Piel of שָׁלַם is used with the personal obj., as at Prov. 13²¹; see Stade-Haupt at length.—וְאָתָּה בְּנִי: 𐤂: very many MSS. edd. (see deR.), וְאֵת יוֹב, and so all VSS; the foll. sing. verb then agrees with the dominant subj., a parallel case Ex. 21⁴, *cf.* Ew., *Lehrb.*, §339, c. St., after Klost., keeps Kt., rdg. אָתָּה, and the verb as Piel, “thy children thou shalt keep alive.” Possibly ‘thy sons’ was an afterthought in the text.—8. וַיְהִי הַיּוֹם: “and there happened the day when”: the phrase also in vv. 11. 18.—[שְׂוֹנֵם]: אֵל: read על; *cf.* עֲלִינוּ, v. 9.—20: 𐤂 (B A *al.*) om.—10. עֲלִיתָ קִיר: various interpretations have been offered by VSS, and, *e.g.*, by EVV (see above); Benz., ‘a walled room,’ in contrast to a roof arbour as at 2 Sam. 16²²; or the wall may refer to the easy outside access. It is best to read קִיר = קָר, ‘coolness,’ the same error of vocalization having entered into Is. 25⁴; *cf.* the ‘cool (בְּקָרָה) upper chamber’ of Jud. 3^{20a}; Klost. suggested the rdg. of this last noun here. 𐤂 𐤂 represented it with ‘a little place’ (𐤂 om. ‘place’), 𐤂 ‘cœnaculum parvum.’—12b-15. The vagueness of the narrative is due to the indefiniteness of the *loquiturs*; the scene must be visualized. Klost., Benz., St. would delete these vv. as secondary, which criticism Baumgartner well regards as ‘zu plump’ (Gunkel-*Eucharisterion*, I, 156). Haupt also argues against St., offering without any certainty possible corrections. Baumgartner, following Gunkel and Gressmann (= BH ‘fortasse’) would elide simply v. 12b and וַיֵּאמֶר לוֹ, v. 13. But there is no sufficient reason for alteration.—13. הַרְדֵּרָה: B† εὐχαριστία for εκστασις.—עֲצֵי: many, following Buhl, *op. cit.*, 39, would read pl., but the collective sing. is preferable; *cf.* Lev. 21¹ with the pl., but in the foll. v. the sing.—15. וַיֵּאמֶר קָרָא לָהּ: 𐤂 om.—16. לְמוֹעֵד הוּא בְעֵת לְמוֹעֵד הוּא בְעֵת: *cf.* Gen. 18¹⁹, בְּעֵת הִיא, and foll. v. 14 with לְמוֹעֵד in parallelism with that phrase. The phrase has been a *crux interpretum*, being assumed as of the round of the year, or even of the spring time. But Skinner on Gen. (after recording earlier interpretations) has ingeniously interpreted the phrase as of the pregnancy period, *cf.* LHeb. תַּיִתָּה ‘pregnant woman,’ and reads accordingly בְּעֵת הִיא. For the present passage he holds properly that the original phrase came to be misunderstood, and that לְמוֹעֵד הוּא was adopted from

v.¹⁷ (where it means 'at the set time') under the influence of Gen. 18¹⁴. For הוּה לִנְי' הוּה has a gloss variation, *eis το μαρτυριον τουτο*. The VSS both here and in Gen. have only makeshifts.—אִישׁ הָאֱלֹהִים: MS 19, Ⓞ Ⓞ om. (Ⓞ^H ✕); *vs. St., BH*, there is deep force in the appeal, "O divine, lie not to me!"—17. הוּה כַּעַר חַיָּה: om. as clumsy repetition from v.¹⁶ with *St., al. (cf. BH)*; the Heb. then reads smoothly, and it is not necessary to change foll. אַשֵּׁר to אַשֵּׁר with *Grr.* and some critics.—20. וַיִּשָּׁב: Ⓞ Ⓞ^H Ⓞ^H as though וַיִּשָּׁב (so *BH* as 'probable'); but the boy was too big for such a posture; Ⓞ^L as *Hif.*—23. הִלְבַּחַי: the *Kt.* presents the archaic vowel-ending.—25. וְהִלֵּךְ וְתִבּוֹא: Ⓞ (*B A al.*) read as 2nd pers. masc. addressed to the servant.—20: Ⓞ Ⓞ^H Ⓞ 'Elisha,' and similarly in v.²⁷.—V.^{b-v.}²⁶ is treated as secondary by *Benz., St.*; but the apparent contradiction in the matter of 'peace' is due to the woman's avoidance of dealing with the servant. Those critics apply the same criticism to vv.^{28. 29.}—26. עָתָה: MSS וְעַתָּה=Ⓞ^L.—At end of v. Ⓞ^L has as plus a repetitive narrative of G.'s fulfilment of orders.—27. מִכֵּנִי: B† arbitrary plus, 'and from thee.'—34. כַּפּוֹ: *Gr. MSS g j n, ℒ* plus 'and his soles on his soles.'—יָגַר: also v.³⁵, and in I. 18⁴² of Elijah's religious prostration, the verb being not otherwise known; the verb there=*Gr. εκυψεν=Ⓞ^H* here (with the root *ghn*). Here Ⓞ *διακαμψεν*; Ⓞ^H MSS + ✕ κ. *ενεφυσησεν επ αυτον*; Ⓞ^L *συνεκαμψεν*, with doublet in variant forms, *ιλααδ, ιγλααδ, ιγαλαδ*. These renderings recur in v.³⁵ along with further essays: Ⓞ *συνεκαμψεν*, Ⓞ^H *συνεκαλυψεν* (=Ⓞ^H root *hḥ*); Ⓞ^L with three variants, *συνεκαμψεν, ενεπνευσεν, ηεδρισαστο, i.e.*, altogether renderings with some five *Gr.* verbs and one transliteration. The verb *ενεφυσησεν* is repetition from I. 17²¹; see *Rahlfs, SS 3, 196, Benz., p. xvi*. The transliteration *ιγααδ* and the verbs *διακαμπτειν, συνκαμπτειν, ανδριζειν* (the latter also used in obscene sense), which have not been explained, represent the *rdg.* יָגַר, *i.e.*, the *Arab.* root 'to fight, to act strenuously,' as in the well-known noun for the Holy War, *jihād*; it would then mean here the vigorous application of body to body. Correction of ℒ might accordingly be made here; at all events it is of interest that this *Arab.* root was known to the early Greek translators.—35. יוּרָה: the only other instance of this root is in *Targ.* to Job 41¹⁰=*Heb.* עִנֵּשׁ (see *Burn.*), and so *Rashi, Kimchi tr.* here; sneezing is a sign of life and of expulsion of demons (so *Haupt*). Ⓞ ℒ 'he yawned.' *Grr.* generally om. the verb, and so Ⓞ^H, or repeat various renderings of יָגַר; Ⓞ^L *διεκινηθη*.—36. וַיִּקְרָא: 1 MS וַיִּקְרָא=O*Grr.*

38. הַגִּירוּלָה: B† om.—39. אָדָר: *Grr.* om. (*cf. Ⓞ^H*), either from identification of the subject with the servant, or by haplog. of *eis/eis*.—אֵרֶב, MSS also with *plene*-spellings: *Grr.*, *αρωθ*; other VSS with indefinite renderings; see *Jastrow, Dict.*, for the Talmudic identification.—נֶגֶן יֵרֶדָה: 'a wild vine,' *cf. חֵית הַשָּׂדֶה*; *Grr. tr.* שׁ with 'in the field,' exc. Ⓞ^L properly with *αργιαν*.—טַבְּנוֹ:

Sebir מַמְנָה, and so MSS; for the gender of בָּנִן cf. I. 19⁴.—ויבא: 2 MSS om., and so B *al.*; A 𐤁𐤏 𐤏 have.—יִרְעֶן: 𐤁𐤏 𐤏 𐤏 𐤏 as sing., approved by St.; but the general ignorance is the point.—40. ויזקו: Grr. in general a sing., A 𐤏^H pl.; again there is no reason, with St., to correct 𐤏.—לְאֲנִים: 'to some'; or to be corrected to 'אֲנִי'; 𐤏^H om.—והמה: Grr., exc. 𐤁𐤏 as והמה.—41. וקרו: 16 MSS קרו = VSS; St. defends 𐤏 as a case of ellipsis, and Haupt cites GK §167, a, in support.—וישלך: 𐤏 can be defended as case of aposiopesis of the subject; St., Šanda argue that the prophet was the actor in the original story; Grr. as impv. pl.; Haupt would read as juss., ויִשְׁלַךְ.—2^o: 𐤁 𐤏^H (𐤏^H obelizes) + 'Elisha to Gehazi his servant,' 𐤁 + 'E. to G.'—היה: Grr. expand with *ετι* (*εκει*) and so 𐤏^H.—42. בעל שלשה: Grr. as בית ש' ; the full name was prob. בית ב' ש' (so St.); 𐤏 'city of giants'; 𐤏 'a city of the Darom.'—bis: 𐤁 MSS variously om.—כרמל: Lev. 2¹⁴, 23¹⁴†; prob. with 𐤏 𐤏 'fresh grits'; cf. Šanda; Grr., *παλαθας*, a form of fruit cakes, as at 1 Sam. 25¹⁸.—בצקלגו: the noun is otherwise unknown; of the Grr. A transliterates, *βακελλεθ* (MS x *κακελεθ*) = 𐤏^H; the others om., exc. N, *εν κωρυκω αυτου*, 'in his wallet,' and so for the noun a citation from Theod. in 𐤏^H. Lagarde on basis of the Gr. transliteration suggested corruption in the Heb., for which see GB.—תן: Grr., exc. 44, the pl., which St. prefers; but the prophet is dealing with his servant, as the sequel shows.—44. ויתן לפניו: OGrr. om. as superfluous.

Ch. 5. Elisha's healing of the Syrian Naaman's leprosy; the sequel, Gehazi's greed and his affliction with the disease. The story is brilliant in its representation of the international manners of the age, as also in its fine sketching of the actors. Naaman, whose name is good Syrian—it appears now in the Ugaritic tablets—was commandant of the king of Aram, *i.e.*, of Damascus, as the reference to its waters shows. The king's name is not given (but it appears as Ben-Hadad in 8⁷), nor is that of the king of Israel; herein the history fails; if authentic, the scene must have occurred in one of the numerous interims of the constant warfare (*cf.* I. 20), with which the history of the Crusades may be compared. It is in vain, as with Šanda, to date the story exactly. Naaman was a *leper*. The Hebrew term is broadly generic, covering a large variety of scabious diseases, being used even of mould in houses. The O.T. references themselves are quite contradictory; the disease might be curable, *e.g.*, the diagnosis and treatment in Lev. 13; or it might be permanent, as in Gehazi's case, *infra*. The patient should be kept in strict quarantine, *e.g.*,

Lev. 15⁵, etc., an ancient regulation, as appears in the story of the four lepers, 7^{3ff.}; yet Naaman remained in good society, and was not under taboo, while the afflicted Gehazi was still a member of society in later story (8^{4ff.}).¹

A captive Israelite maid has pity on her master—a delicate touch in the story—and suggests to her mistress that he might be cured by *the prophet in Samaria* (v.³). Naaman carries the suggestion to the king, who at once gladly dispatches his favourite minister to the king of Israel with a letter written in due form (v.⁶—*n.b.* the epistolary *And now*, for which see Note), and with a handsome present. Such an instance of international medical courtesy is corroborated by earlier ancient sources. A long letter from Hattushil, king of the Hittites, to Kadashmanturgu king of Babylon (*ca.* 1275 B.C.), contains an extensive memorandum in reply to an inquiry concerning the whereabouts of a Babylonian physician (*asū*) and an exorcist (*āšīpu*), who had been sent to the Hittite court, but had never returned. And a late copy of an ancient Egyptian story tells of the mission of the god Khonsu, sent by Ramses II to the king of Hatti to cure his daughter, and how the devil was expelled.² The Israelite king is represented as in an excessive quandary, *he rent his clothes* (v.⁷)—an ironical touch, or just the talk of the town that was brought to Elisha? The latter is presented as having a house in Samaria, and yet he was last in Shunem; in the next story we find him again by the Jordan (6^{1ff.}), then at Dothan (6¹³), but thereafter once more in Samaria (6^{24ff.})—*i.e.*, there is no biographical sequence. He hears of the consternation at court, and solemnly bids the king to send the suppliant to him, that the latter (at least) *may know that there is a prophet in Israel* (v.⁸). Naaman comes to the prophet's house with full cavalcade (vv.^{9ff.}), but Elisha vouchsafes him no interview (*cf.*

¹ See BDD, *JE*, *s.v.* 'Leprosy,' W. Ebstein, *Die Medizin im A.T.*, 75 ff.; also Haupt's note in his *Numbers*, p. 45, expressing doubt whether there is a single case in the O.T. of true leprosy, *elephantiasis Græcorum*, as it was known to the ancients. The malady was also known to Hippocrates as the Phœnician disease.

² For the Hittite letter (text in H. H. Figulla and E. F. Weidner, *Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi*, 1 [1916], 10) see F. Bilabel, *Gesch. Vorderasiens u. Aegyptens*, 1 (1927), 156, 294, and for the Egyptian story *ARE* 3, 188 ff.

4^{25ff.}), simply sends him a message to *go and wash in the Jordan seven times*, and so he would be cleansed. Naaman was indignant; he had thought that the prophet would honour him with his presence, *would stand . . . and wave his hand towards the spot* (of the disease), *and exorcise the be-lepered* (sore) (v.¹¹). The lordly exorcising gesture he expected is the same as that practised by Moses and Aaron in the invocation of the plagues, by the 'stretching out of the hand,' or of 'the rod,' and in the miracle at the Red Sea (Ex. 8³, etc., 14²¹). He is further disgusted that the muddy waters of Israelite Jordan are prescribed, and not the pure, cool streams of the Damascus oasis, the names of which are uniquely given (v.¹²). However (vv.¹³⁻¹⁴) following the advice of his servants (their assumed title for him, 'My father,' is to be corrected—see Note) *he went down and he dipped seven times in the Jordan* (Grr. with the verb 'to baptize' as in later use—cf. the sanctity of these waters in the N.T. and in the Mandaic tradition), *and his flesh became again like the flesh of a little child, and he was clean*. He returns to Elisha, and confesses that *there is no God in all the earth but in Israel* (cf. the Muslim cry, "No god but Allah"), involuntary profession of the happy convalescent. He begs him to *take a present*, literally *a blessing*, in courteous Oriental language, but the prophet refuses (vv.¹⁵⁻¹⁶). Thereupon he asks the prophet's approval of his taking some of the holy soil of YHWH's land (cf. Zech. 2¹⁶), on which he may worship, for hereafter he will *not celebrate holocaust and sacrifice to other gods, but to YHWH* (v.¹⁷). But he begs indulgence for one exception (v.¹⁸): *In this matter may YHWH pardon thy servant! When my lord comes into the house of Rimmon to worship there, and he leaning on my hand* (the same courtly expression as title in 7²⁻¹⁷), *and I am to worship in the house of Rimmon, upon my worshipping in the house of Rimmon YHWH pardon thy servant for this thing!* This repetitious line of talk has been subject of variations in the VSS and of modern criticism (see Note), but it is best to let it stand. The prophet approves with his *pax tecum* (v.¹⁹). This indulgence has ever since been a stumbling-block to orthodox scholars, beginning with Lucian, who inserted a face-saving clause (see Note). But while YHWH was God of the whole world (cf. v.¹⁵), his worship was not obligatory

on others than Israel; *cf.* the (probably late) declaration in Mic. 4⁵. Rimmon is the well-known Ramman of the Assyro-Babylonian pantheon, a name and phase of Addu-Hadad (see Comm., I. 15¹⁸). He appears to have been domesticated in Damascus; Ben-Hadad of *loc. cit.* was son of Tab-Rimmon.³ In spite of his master's refusal of the proposed generous gift, Gehazi, that very disagreeable servant (*e.g.*, 4^{25ff.}), resolves to profit from *this Syrian*, and follows after him (vv. 20^{ff.}). He had his lie ready to hand, and receives from the generous benefactor double of the gift he had asked for, although slyly he allows the donor to urge it upon him. He brings the gift home and hides it. But the second-sight of his master uncovers his lie, and he is given an appropriate doom: *the leprosy of Naaman shall adhere to thee and thy seed forever*. And so it befell the servant: *he went from his presence be-lepered like snow*. *Cf.* the diagnosis of 'white' phenomena of the disease in Lev. 13, and Herodotus's report of kindred diseases in Persia, λέπρω and λεύκη (i, 138).

1. Introduction of Naaman the Syrian commander-in-chief, *a great man before his lord*; *cf.* the phrase, 'a great woman,' 4⁸. There is a remarkable expression of early Hebrew religion in the statement that *by him YHWH had given deliverance to Aram*, although this included victory over Israel, as the story proceeds to detail. *And the man was a doughty soldier, a leper* (Heb. a ppl., *be-lepered*): this clumsy sentence is paraphrased in EVV; the first attribute should be excised as gloss of preceding 'great man'. 3. *Recover him of his leprosy*: so EVV, recent translations varying with the verbs 'cure,' 'relieve.' The verb cannot be explained from the Heb., and is an importation from a well-known Akkadian root, signifying exorcism, etc.; here the man is the object, in v. 11 the sore spot. Note that the language belongs to the Syrian milieu. 5. For the specie values see the Archæologies of Nowack (§§36, 37), Benzinger (§§41, 42). Šanda proposes that the gold was double the value of the silver, and that here the talent

³ See KAT 442 ff., Deimel, *Pantheon Babylonicum*; while the god may not have been Western, he was early domesticated in the West; *e.g.*, 'the mourning of Hadad-Rimmon in the valley of Megiddo,' Zech. 12¹¹. Šanda properly cites the Libanese place-name, Brummana, derived from *Bêt-R.*

is reckoned after the older usage of 3600 shekels, or else with the later equivalence of 3000 shekels the 6000 of gold would have been stated as two talents. The figures indeed appear to be extravagant, story-wise. **12.** *Abanah and Pharpar*: the former name (Kt) is identical with *Amanah* of Song 4⁸, and so K̄r. demands here; it is the Syrian Mountain known as Ammana in Ass. records, neighbouring to the Lebanon, doubtless the Anti-Lebanon. The stream is named after its source, and is universally identified with the Chrysoas of the Greeks, the modern Nahr Baradā, the chief stream in the oasis, while the Pharpar is identified with the 'Auwaj, the old name being preserved in the Wady Barbar.⁴ **17.** *In re* the transfer of the holy soil Thenius notes this as the earliest known example of a widespread custom; he cites the report of Benjamin of Tudela (Wright, *Early Travels in Palestine*, 103) that the Jewish synagogue in Persian Nehardea was composed wholly of earth and stone brought from Jerusalem; the empress Helena similarly transported the holy soil to Rome. **22. 23.** *Two suits* (EVV literally, *changes of garments/ raiment*); see Note for the secondary character of this item in v.²³, and see below on v.²⁶. **24.** *The hill*: the word has defied identification; it may be reminiscent of the city quarter in which the prophet was lodged; cf. 'the Ophel' (the same word) in Jerusalem. **26a.** Mystical language of the second-sight is used here: *Went not my heart, when a man turned back from his chariot to meet thee?* The Grr. are unanimous in interpolating 'with thee' after the first verb, followed by modern translations, and so critics in general; but how could so important an item have fallen out? The ancient psychological phrasing should not be tampered with, as has also been done with the mysteriously indefinite *a man*, or *some one* (Moff.), vs. the usual incorrect translation, 'the man,' of some VSS, GV FV EVV; the seer saw 'only in part.'⁵

⁴ For the Ass. references see Tiglath-Pileser IV's annals for the third year, CP 315, ARA 1, §770; and for the rivers Robinson, LBR 446 ff., Baedeker, and Dussaud, TH ch. 5, §§4, 5.

⁵ For the extensive functions of the heart in the Bible, constantly paired with the psyche, see Delitzsch, *Biblical Psychology*, sec. xii, Cremer, *Bibl.-theol. Wörterbuch*, s.v. καρδία. For this case of second-sight cf. Ezekiel's experiences, Eze. 8 (idolatry in the temple), 11¹³ (death of Pelatiah).

26b. *Is it a time to take the money, and to take garments and oliveyards?*, etc., so **ח**. Objection to this lies in the reference to the merely opportune, whereas the servant is castigated for his dishonesty; in the repetition of the infinitive 'to receive'; and in the details of real property, into which the cash had not been converted. Read with change of **כּר**. of the two verbs in question, and following the **Grr.** and their congeners, also **פ**: *Now thou hast taken the money, and (so) thou wilt take (all kinds of property)?*, with sarcastic interrogation. Further, with a variant plus in most **Grr.**, in place of 'garments' read (*take*) *with it gardens, i.e., rdg. bô gnym for bgdym.*

1. נַעֲנָן: the name in a Ugaritic genealogical tablet (*Syria*, 1934, 244 ff.).—[צַנָּא] נַיָּךְ [אַרְיָם]: 1 MS, **ס** om.; vs. St., variation from the usual formula, e.g., 'host of Israel,' is no argument against **ח**.—נָבֹר חַיִל: **ס**^L om., but not necessarily with a text different from **ח**; for its early intrusion see Comm., and so *SBOT*, *BH*.—נִצְיָע: **Grr.** tr well with λελεπρωμένος.—**2.** נִדְרִיִּים: for the *Gr.* μονόζωνοι, Thackeray finds the mng. 'bandits' (*Sept. and Jewish Worship*, 23 f.).—וְהָיָה לְפָנַי: עֲבַד/עֲבַר לְפָנַי.—**3.** אֲתָלִי: cf. אֲתָלִי, 'O that for me,' Ps. 119⁵; see Burn. on the pointing here as of pl. constr., and so understood by **ט** **ס**; **ס**^L has a doublet, κ. δεηθειη του προσωπον, the verb=הִלֵּי[ן] (Burn.).—יֵאָסֶף אֶרְצוֹ: the desiderated mng. cannot be had from the *Heb.* verb, 'to gather' (cf. the attempts of the *Jewish comm.*); the verb here=Akk. *asāpu*, 'to exorcise.'—**4.** לְאִרְיָה: because of the aposiopesis after v.³ **Grr.** understood לְאִרְיָה, i.e., the woman spoke 'to her husband,' and then **ס**^L added, "and it was announced to the king"; see Rahlfs, *SS* 3, 26 f., 206 f., for correction of Lagarde's text.—**5.** לֵךְ בָּא: "come, go!"; examples in *GB* 181b.—**6.** וְעַתָּה: the introduction to the contents of a letter after the formal address; see Comm., 10².—**7.** אַךְ דַּעַן=Engl. "just know!"; for the imperative phrase דַּעַן וְדַעַן cf. I. 20⁷.—**8.** *Elisha the divine*: 1 MS, **ס**^L om. the first noun, **ס** om. the second; cf. v.²⁰.—**9.** בְּטוֹבוֹ וּבְרַבּוֹ, **כּר**. **ס** **ס**^H εν υπνω κ. εν αρματι=ס^H **פ**; **ס**^L pluralizes both nouns; the collective sing. is to be kept.—**10.** נִלְאָךְ: **Grr.**, αγγελον, which **ס**^H asterisks, **ס** om.; the verb alone is sufficient.—וְיִקְרָה . . . וְיִשָּׁב: juss. and impv. are in correct sequence, cf. I. 1¹². **ס** **פ** read the second verb as יִקְרָה, "(the flesh) will become clean," which St. (with incorrect citation of the **Grr.**) prefers; but the verb is used of the person in vv.¹², ¹³.—**11.** וְעַתָּה: **OGrr.** om. because of their interpretation of the following.—יָהוּה: 1 MS, B A N *al.* om.; there is no reason for omission, vs. *BH*; Naaman knew the name of Israel's God (cf. vv.^{17f.}), as did Mesha the Moabite.—וְהָיָה יָדוֹ אֶל הַמָּקוֹם: **Grr.**, "and will set his hand upon the place,"

Ⓞ^L exegetically, 'upon the leprosy'; similarly Ⓟ 'et tangeret manu sua locum lepræ'; the prepositional phrase is lacking in N *al.*, is asterisked in Ⓢ^H, and St. regards it as 'spurious,' an unreasonable judgment; the exorcising gesture was to be made 'towards the place (of the spot)'; Sanda objects on ground of the narrow use of 'place'; but *cf.* the parallel *בְּקִוּוֹ הַשֶּׁחֵן*, Lev. 13¹⁹. Kit., GB (p. 456), and more recently Vincent (Dussaud Vol., I, 269, n. 2) proposes reference to 'the Sanctuary-place,' a notion long ago anticipated by 'certain scholars,' acc. to Poole, but again an invention.—12. אֲנִי : Kt.=Grr., Ⓢ^H Ⓟ; אֲנִי קָרָה Kt., and Kt. of many MSS=Ⓣ Ⓢ=Song 4⁸; a case of labial variation.—מִרְאֵי : correctly transliterated in A N *al.*, abused in B *al.*—אֲדָרְךָ : Grr. pref. *προρευθεὶς*=Ⓢ, reminiscent of v.¹⁰.—13. וַיֹּאמְרוּ : 2 MSS, most Grr. om., Ⓢ^H ✕.—אֲבִי : MSS 96, 151 om. With the usual interpretation as 'my father' may be compared Akk. *abu* in titles of address, also the military term, *abu ummāni*, 'father of the army.' There is much variety in the Grr.; OGr. om. the word, the Hex. translates with *πατερ*, but Lucianic texts have *πατερ ε*, and so with the Three. Accordingly since Then.=BH correction to אָב has generally been made. But see Note on בִּי, I. 3¹⁷, and Honeyman's identification of it with the present word, as with the mng., 'granted,' and so as conditional, verifying the Greek 'if,' which is expected before the foll. verb, and so inserted in the EVV.—14. וַיִּרֶר : 3 MSS deR. וַיִּלֶךְ=Ⓢ א. אִישׁ-הָאֱלֹהִים : Ⓞ^L; other Grr., 'Elisha,' and so in v.¹⁵.—17. וְגַם 'and if not'; *cf.* 2 Sam. 13²⁶, and the positive expression וַיֵּשׁ, 10¹⁵.—מִשָּׂא : Ⓞ^L texts *γομορ*, the original translation, otherwise corrupted to *γομορ*=עָרָר (Ex. 16³⁶, etc.); see Rahlfs, SS 3, 288.—18. This apparently clumsy bit of diction has naturally suffered since the day of the VSS; for the latter reference may be made to BH. The initial 'for this thing' appears duplicated in the final 'in this thing'; 'in my worshipping in the house of Rimmon' appears unnecessary, and this is evident origin of the correction to 'his worshipping' in the Gr. (B A *al.*, but not א) and Ⓢ, which would evade the notion that Naaman did so actually worship, *i.e.*, in ritual acts, as the verb means. But the proselyte makes full and brave confession before the prophet.—בְּהִשְׁתַּחֲוֹתָי : error by repetition of preceding *הִשְׁתַּחֲוִי*, and then Aramaizing attempt at pointing as infin. To this assertion Ⓞ^L adds an exculpatory plus, *προσκαυτησασα αμα αυτω εγω Κυριω τω θεω μου*.—גֹּא : Kt., but not Kt. : very many MSS om. (so deR.), and so Ⓣ; Ⓞ^L *μοι*. The ignoring was due to its absence with the same verb above; but the precative element in the second supplication has force.—19. כְּבָרָה אֶרֶץ : Ⓞ^L texts retain original transliteration, *εἰς Χαβραθα τ. γγ*=an א text, 'in Chabratha terram'; Ⓞ texts with primitive corruption *Δεβραθα* (*cf.* Ⓞ); Ⓢ^H uniquely, 'from the land of Israel.' The word כִּ occurs in Gen. 35¹⁶, 48⁷; see Lexx., and Benz., *Arch.*, 192.—20. אִישׁ הָאֱלֹהִים : Ⓞ om.; 2 Heb.

MSS om. prec. אֵלֶיֶשׁע; cf. v. 8.—ולקחתי: for consecration cf. 7^a, and see Dr., *Tenses*, §139.—21. ויראה: 1 MSS וירא, 2 MSS ויראהו; Grr. (exc. i) read the object αυτον, and T supplied it with “and saw a man running”; the text gives a case of the uncontracted form of the verb; see Note, I. 10²⁹.—ויפל: correct term for dismounting, cf. Gen. 24⁶⁴, and so L κατεπηδησεν (=E in Gen.): E^H επεστρεψεν (=S^H), borrowed from v. 28 to avoid the harsh sense of the verb.—22. עתה זה: also I. 17²⁴.—ושני הלפוח בנדים: Kamp., Kit., St., Eissf. (cf. BH) eliminate the phrase here and in v. 23, as the ‘fresh suits’ could not be the object of ויצר there; but rather, with Benz., the phrase is original here, inducing the later intrusion in vv. 23. 28.—23. הואל: cf. 6³, etc.; E om.; L επιεικ(ε)ως, ‘kindly!’; E^H (A=S^H) ουκουσ, as though הלא, which Rahlfs defends as orig. Gr. in SS 3, 288, but does not accept in his *Septuaginta*.—קה: many MSS וקה.—ויסרן בו: E om.; rightly with Šanda, a phrase ‘characteristic of Oriental good manners,’ as vs. St., arguing, as the Gr. opined, that Gehazi needed no urging, and so BH, ‘probabiliter.’—B† om., causing BH to note, ‘prob. delendum’ (!).—הקטום: the noun to be connected with הקט, ‘mold,’ Ex. 32⁴; see al-Fāsi, s.v. (ed. Skoss, 1, 584), and Torrey, *JNES* 1943, 300 f.; here and at Is. 3²² it may then mean ‘money bags.’—24. ויבא: OGr. as pl., which St. (cf. BH) prefers; but the chief actor is the proper subject.—אל העפל: T ‘to a hidden place,’ Grr., εις το σκοτεινον, i.e., as האפל, and similarly Y, ‘iam vesperi’; I texts have ‘in locum obscurum’ (=Grr.), ‘in terram Gaphela,’ ‘in terra Gophera,’ i.e., these two cases based upon unique and exact transliteration, ‘Gophela’; S ‘in side of a mountain,’ with which cf. Rashi, Kimchi, ‘in a lofty place,’ with correct etymology.—25. אל [ויעטור] אל: is expected, but so all MSS.—באן Kt.; Kṛ., many MSS באן: St.-Haupt retain the Kt. =באן, cf. 1 Sam. 10¹⁴, Job 8².—26. לא: corrected by St., Šanda (cf. BH) to הלא: but the interrog. particle is not required; see GK §150, a. לא לבי הליך: Grr. plus ‘with thee’; L “was not my heart with thee?” This plus has been carried over into modern VSS (JV in brackets); Moff., “was I not present in spirit?”; Chic. B., “was I not with you in spirit?” Other ancient VSS paraphrase: T “in the spirit of prophecy it was shown to me”; S “my heart showed to me”; Y “my heart was present.” Cf. a similar expression in 1 Cor. 5³.—איש: Grr., T S ‘the man.’—העת: Grr. as העת, so also Y, for which spelling see Eze. 23⁴³, Ps. 74⁸; in Eze. 27³⁴ the mistaken Kṛ. as here. The interpretation as נע induced misunderstanding of the foll. verbs.—לקחה את הכסף ולקחה בנדים: E Y read both verbs as perfects, then, with exclusion of B A, the Grr. have a plus, translating the second verb as future, and representing בנדים with εν αυτω κηπους=בנינים. These corrections are to be accepted (see Comm.), following Klost., Benz., and subsequent scholars; see Burn. (who is doubtful), St. at length. The item of vineyards is

in line with the following list of real property, while 'clothes' of \mathfrak{H} is repetition of the gloss in v.²³. \mathfrak{T} recognized trouble in this speech, and inserted after the above words, "and thou hast thought in thy heart to buy (oliveyards)."

6¹⁻⁷. The sunken axe-head made to float. The place of *the sons of the prophets*, where *they sit before* their master (cf. 4³⁸), was *too narrow* for them, and decision was made to move down to the Jordan, where timber was to be had in plenty for a larger conventicle. For the large trees still to be found in that valley see Abel, *GP* I, 213, noting the poplar, tamarisk, etc. An iron axe-head is dropped into the water; Elisha recovers it by a feat of imitative magic; cf. 4^{38ff.}

VV.^{8ff.}. The 'political stories' of Elisha begin here.

VV.⁸⁻²³. The Aramæan military movements discovered by Elisha's second-sight; the troops sent to seize him afflicted with blindness, but honourably sent home. Any historical basis of this story is indiscernible. It is notable for the prophet's declaration, *More are they with us than they with them* (v.¹⁶), with which cf. Elijah's immortal challenge, I. 18²¹.

8. The warring against Israel was that of guerrilla bands; cf. 5², and *inf.*, v.²³. The Heb. word translated in EVV with *my camp* is a *unicum*; with slight change it can be read as from the same root in the verb at end of v.⁹; read here, *In such and such a place ye shall go down*, the verb being used in the sense of military 'descent.' The two similar words are rendered variously by the Grr., Lucian developing the notion of 'ambush,' followed by \mathfrak{V} and many modern critics, also by Moffatt, Chic. B. But the wish is father to the thought; the Heb. words must then be entirely ignored. 9. Elisha, true patriot, reports to his king the movements of the enemy.

12. The prophet was famous abroad from the Naaman episode; but there was also the fame of underground reports, as repeated in the local news of the Great Wars of 1914-18 and 1939-45.

13. The story places Elisha at a strategic point, *in Dothan*, at the entrance into the Highlands of Ephraim.

15. The Heb. noun, *servant (of the man of God)*, is unique in these stories; with substitution of a word that could easily have been corrupted, read: *And at dawn the man of God rose early and went out*, and so similarly Moffatt and Chic. B.; see Note.

17. For *the horses and chariots of fire* cf. 2¹¹.

19. The distance between Dothan and Samaria is about nine and one-half miles. 21. 22. Elisha insists that the king treat his captives as honourable guests. His chivalrous inquiry has been variously translated or amended: EVV *Wouldest thou smite those whom thou hast taken captive with thy sword and with thy bow?*; JV *Hast thou taken captive with thy sword and with thy bow those whom thou wouldest smite?*—these variant modern translations indicating the problem of interpretation. Ⓞ^L, followed by most critics, Moffatt, Chic. B., insert a negative, “whom thou hast *not* taken captive.” But the complete absence of the negative in the other Grr. argues for Ⓞ^H, as *vs.* Lucian, a clever adapter of texts. Read with EVV, and understand here a rule of war in the technical term, ‘captured by sword and bow’; captives that had surrendered were not to be slain, and so *a fortiori* in the present case. It shows the prophet’s generous concern for his prisoners, now become his guests. Cf. his gentlemanly, truly Oriental conduct towards Naaman (5^{15ff.}).

2. מִקוּם: Ⓞ^H has with asterisk; Grr. om., exc. MS v with *οικον*, Ⓞ^L with *σκαπην* (also corrupted to *σκαπην*), ‘shelter’; see Rahlf’s, SS 3, 207.—5. הַקּוּרָה: a few MSS pref. אַת; the particle is prefixed irregularly to the foll. noun, doubtless by careless gloss insertion. For attempts at correction of the text see Burn., St.—וַיֹּאמֶר: Ⓞ om.—שָׂאוּל: Ⓞ texts (B *al.*), *κεκρυμμενον* (=Ⓞ^H), error for *κεχρημενον*, Ⓞ^L N *al.*—6. הַצֶּדֶה: Hif., but read by the VSS unanimously as Kal., הַצֶּדֶה, which is to be accepted.—8. וַיּוֹעִן אֵל: the same combination 2 Ch. 20²¹; for this use of the prep. cf. v.¹¹.—פָּלְגֵי אֶלְמִנִי: see Montg., *Dan.*, on 8¹³.—תַּתְּחִי: cf. תַּתְּחִים, v.⁹. Here Ⓞ Ⓞ^H *παρεμβάλω*=Ⓞ^H, *i.e.*, verbal paraphrase of the noun as ‘I will encamp’ from root תָּחַה; Ⓞ^L *ποιήσωμεν* (so pl. in Ⓞ^H Ⓞ^H) *ενεδρον*+arbitrary κ. *εποίησαν* (=Ⓞ^L); the word in v.⁹ is rendered by Ⓞ Ⓞ^H with *κεκρυπται*=Ⓞ^H, but by Ⓞ^L consistently with *ενεδρευοισιν*. Ⓞ Ⓞ^H tr. both words with sense of ‘concealment,’ Ⓞ of ‘ambush.’ Since Then. emendation to תַּתְּחִי, תַּתְּחִים, from the root ‘to hide,’ has been preferred by many, *e.g.*, by Burn., St., Sk., but such a corruption in Ⓞ cannot be explained. Šanda sugg. תַּתְּחִי אֵל, ‘encamp with me,’ and below תַּתְּחִים. But it is best to read with Joüon (*Mél.*, 5, 477), תַּתְּחִי, תַּתְּחִים, in line with the use of that verb for military ‘descent,’ *e.g.*, Jer. 21¹³, and so frequently in Syriac.—9. אִישׁ הָאֲלוּהִים: Ⓞ Hex., ‘Elisha,’ and so v.¹⁰, naming the otherwise anonymous prophet.—10. וְהוֹדִיעָה: OGrr. om., and so St.; but the mng. is clear: “and he would warn it (the place), and it would keep on guard.”—11. מִי מִשְׁלֵנוּ: אֵל טָלַח יִשְׂרָאֵל: the second word is criticized by some for use of ש,

but this good N Israelite particle is appropriate in citation of a Syrian. VSS (exc. \mathfrak{S}) ' (who) betrays me ? ', as though מִלְּנִי from a supposed מִלְּנִי , which latter emendation is accepted by Klost., *al.* (*cf.* the suggestions in *BH*), but it is properly condemned by Burn., St., since the verb ' to uncover ' is not used in this sense with the personal object. St. unnecessarily accepts Ew.'s emendation to מִלְּנִי , ' of us all. ' The foll. אֵל מִלֵּךְ in the sense of partisanship is supported by Hos. 3³, Jer. 15¹, Eze. 36⁹, and *cf.* v.⁸ above.—**12.** For the nuance of the bedchamber *cf.* Eccl. 10²⁰.—**13.** אֵיקָה: MSS, edd. (see deR.), אֵיפָה ; אֵיקָה might be expected, as in Song 1⁷, with Syr., Jaram. ; the form in -*ó* may be due to artificial assimilation to אֵיפָה, or may be a genuine form in distinction from אֵיקָה, ' how, ' v.¹⁵.—רתן: Grt., Δωθαεμ(ε)-=Judith 4⁶, 7¹⁸, following tradition of pronunciation as in רתונה, Gen. 37¹⁷.—**14.** כּוּסִים: read collective sing. with \mathfrak{S} , as in v.¹⁵.—**15.** מְשֻׁרֵת: so all VSS (*e.g.*, ο λειτουργος), but a unique term for ' servant ' in these stories; St. om. אִישׁ הָאֱלֹהִים; מ' איש האלהים; but a subj. is required; Klost., *al.* (*BH* ' fortasse ') would read מְשֻׁרֵתָה; but closer to \mathfrak{H} would be an otherwise unknown noun, שְׁהָרָה, *cf.* שָׁרָר, ' dawn, ' and *n.b.* easy confusion in early script of מ and ש. For the phrase וישכם לקום *cf.* Ps. 127²; Grt. ignore the inf., exc. \mathfrak{S}^L with το πρωι.—**16.** אֹרֶת: some 20 MSS אָרֶת; read אָרֶת.—**17.** כּוּסִים וּרְכָב אֵשׁ: ' horses-and-chariots-of-fire ' ; for the double *regens* in the constr. relation *cf.* Dt. 3⁵, 2 Ch. 8⁵; the fuller expression in 2¹¹.—**18.** מְנוּרִים: also Gen. 19¹¹; Safil intensive=' to dazzle ' ; the root is closely related to נְרִיר (leucoma); the latter is parallel to root *brr*; see Montg., *Aram. Incantation Texts from Nippur* (1913), 93, where a Talmudic formula of prescription against blindness of same etymological origin is noted.— \mathfrak{S}^L + ' the Lord. '—**19.** לֹא 2⁰: B *al.* om.—זה: for this form see the 10 cases cited in BDB 262.—**20.** פָּקָה: 20 MSS + נָה =Grt.; *cf.* v.¹⁷.—הָנָה: VSS tr. as though הָנָה, but this of necessity; *cf.* v.²⁵, and see Dr., *Tenses*, §135, 6; there is no reason to emend with Grätz, St., *al.*—**21.** אֵל אֵלֵי־שָׁע: B *al.* om., \mathfrak{S}^M ✕.—[אָבָה]: read abs. inf., אֵלֵי־שָׁעָה, with \mathfrak{T} \mathfrak{S} , and with the Gr. use of the ppl. for this syntax.—**23.** וַיִּלְכְּנוּ: carelessly omitted in some Gr. MSS, *e.g.*, B; 2 Heb. MSS om. prec. verb.

6²⁴-ch. 7. The siege of Samaria by Ben-Hadad of Aram, resulting in starvation and actual cannibalism within the walls, and the Israelite king's threat against Elisha as author of all the evil (6²⁴-31); the royal audience with Elisha, and the latter's oracle of the coming relief of the famine, with the doom pronounced upon a sneering adjutant (6³²-7²); the discovery by four lepers of the flight of the Syrian host upon rumour of an onslaught by North Syrian kings, and their looting of the abandoned camp (7³-8); their report to the city and to the king, whose scouts verify their news (vv.⁹-15);

the spoiling of the camp and relief of the starving citizens, along with the fate of the incredulous officer (vv.¹⁶⁻²⁰). Cf. *Ant.*, ix, 4, 4-5. This story is the most elaborate in the Elisha cycle, similar in its compilation of distinct anecdotes to the one included in the Elijah cycle, I. 20, but there with 'the man of God' nameless. One definite historical datum is given in the story of the murder of Ben-Hadad by Hazael, and the prophet's concern therein through his second-sight. The epithet 'son of a murderer' cast at the anonymous Israelite king (6³²) need not be interpreted literally, and so to be understood definitely as of Ahab's son Joram (so Josephus, early comm., Thenius, Rawlinson, Wellhausen, *al.*), or of Jehu's son Jehoahaz (so Kuenen). The fairly contemporary Aramaic Zakar stele only increases the complications of our knowledge of the Syrian kingdoms. Nor are there indications sufficient to pursue critical literary theories, as with Benzinger, of two sources, paralleling Elijah stories, one of a siege of starvation of the inhabitants (6^{24ff.}), the other of a general famine, to which *this evil* (6³³) and the officer's scoffing inquiry about *windows in heaven* (7²) would belong. Kittel holds that the story was originally aligned after the episode of the seven years' famine (8^{1ff.}). There is no basis for exact historical dating. However the narrative contains reminiscences at close hand of historical realities; *e.g.*, a siege of Samaria by Aram, the reference to the Hittites and Musrites (7⁶), as also minor details, *e.g.*, the harrowing event of mothers eating their children by mutual bargain, with the king's human indignation, which he would vent extravagantly upon Elisha, and the humorous anecdote of the lepers' discovery of the abandoned camp. Also Elisha again appears in a political rôle, as in 3^{4ff.}, here sitting in conclave with the civic elders, and assuming the offensive against the king in the spirit of Elijah and Micaiah.

25. An ass's head at eighty shekels of silver. For records of similar soaring prices for odd foods cf. Plutarch, *Artaxerxes*, xxiv, how the Kadisians "cut off the draught animals, so that an ass's head was worth almost 60 drachmæ," and Pliny, *Historia naturalis*, viii, 82, who relates that at a certain siege by Hannibal a mouse rose in the market to 200 denarii (if the Biblical figures seem absurd, they have parallels in other

ancient story !); these references were early made by the commentators cited by Poole. **25.** *The fourth part of a kab of dove's dung for five shekels of silver.* A kab equals about two litres, and the shekel may be rated as a current shilling. For the modern equivalents of these terms of quantity and price see BDD, 'Weights and Measures,' the Archaeologies of Nowack (§§35-7), and Benzinger (§§40-2). 'Dove's dung' is the translation of two distinct words appearing in Kt. and K̄r. here. The earliest interpretation of such an impossible food is by Josephus, noting that this stuff was used 'in place of salt.' In support of this interpretation is adduced Josephus's note in *BJ* v, 13, 7, that at the siege of Jerusalem "some were driven to such straits as to search the old dunghills of cattle and to eat the dung." Virgil's 'fames obscoena' and similar Classical references are cited by Poole. Post (*DB s.v.* 'Dove') quotes a Spanish author concerning a famine in England in 1316 when the people ate pigeon dung, but this may be only a Scriptural reminiscence. Burney and Post hold that the literal meaning is by no means certainly incorrect. Bochart started a fresh and sensible interpretation (*Hierozoicon*, i, 42, cited by Poole at length, cf. Gesenius, *Thesaurus*, Burney), suggesting that 'dove dung' is to be compared with an Arabic term for a certain herb, 'sparrow dung.' This interpretation may well be accepted, unless we are to regard these items as the invention of popular, almost humorous talk. For drastic attempts at emendation of the text by Grätz, Klostermann, Cheyne, Winckler, see *SBOT*. **26.** The woman makes appeal to the king in usual legal formula, *Save!* (EVV 'help'), as in the appeal of another woman (2 Sam. 14⁴). **27.** *If YHWH do not help thee:* so the prevailing interpretation in ancient and modern VSS; rather, *Not so! YHWH save thee!* See note for various interpretations and attempted emendations. **28. 29.** For the tragedy of parents eating their own children in a siege as a common occurrence see Dt. 28^{56f.}, Eze. 5¹⁰, Lam. 2²⁰, 4¹⁰ (with 'boiling' as here); for historical cases there is one in the Roman siege of Jerusalem, cited by Josephus, *BJ* vi, 3, 4, another at Ashurbanipal's siege of Babylon (*KB* 2, 190; *ARA* 2, §794), along with cases cited by Poole. **30.** The king wore his royal dress, but privately the dress of affliction underneath, as might be seen from his

high position on the wall; this note serves to explain his indignation at Elisha, the one spiritual potency, who was idly *sitting down* (v.³²), and yet responsible for the horrible incident.

31. The king's curse upon himself, *if the head of Elisha ben Shaphat shall stand upon him to-day*, has provoked much discussion; it was a hasty curse, which he hardly expected to carry out, although the prophet, who knew of it 'in the spirit,' shut the door against any messenger. The translation of the following vv. exhibits the straits of the EVV in precisising the *personæ loquentes* (cf. Moffatt, Chic. B.): **32.** *And Elisha was sitting in his house, and the elders sitting with him. And he* [EVV *the king* in italics or brackets] *sent a man from his presence. Before the messenger came to him, he said to the elders: See ye how this son of a murderer hath sent to take away my head? Look! When the messenger cometh, shut the door, and hold the door fast against him! Is not the sound of his master's feet behind him?* **33.** *And while he yet talked with them, behold, the messenger was coming down to him; and he* [JV *the king* in brackets] *said: Behold, this is the evil from YHWH* [EVV *this evil is of the Lord*]. *Why should I wait for YHWH any longer?* The evident difficulties have led to many drastic revisions; see Stade at length, and cf. the notes in *BH*. The one necessary correction is to read in v.³³ *the king* (*melek* in place of *mal'ak*, 'messenger'). Wellhausen, in Bleek,⁴ 251, n. 4, and Stade would also elide all reference to the messenger, reading 'king' in place of it throughout, and omitting "and he sent a man from him." But Elisha saw 'only in part'; it was the king himself who came, while the prophet expected only an underling, of whom he was afraid, and in whose face he shut the door. There exists at the end of the passage an anacoluthon as to the opening of the door to the king. To Elisha's surprise the king himself appeared. The earliest explanation of the interlude of barring the door against the king is that given by Josephus, that the delay would give the king time to change his mind. *This son of a murderer*: a pure epithet, *i.e.*, 'a murderous fellow,' as Winckler recognized (*GI* 1, 52), after common Oriental usage; cf. 'whore's son,' 1 Sam. 20³⁰. The final inquiry is one of profound impatience with God. Ch. 7. **1.** The prophet's reply in a brief oracle couched in terms of the market. Prices were

to go lower, but still remain high; a *seah* (EVV *measure*) = 12 litres (*v. supra*, 6²⁵); Šanda cites Mishna *Erubin*, vii, 2, quoting 4 seahs of barley at 1 shekel. Cf. the statement of high prices, rated by the shekel, in time of distress in the Panammuwa inscr., line 6, 'in the gate,' *i.e.*, in the market; Šanda *cf.* the similar Akkadian term, *ina abulli*. **2.** For the *captain* (for the official term, *thirdling*, see I. 9²²) *on whose hand the king leaned*, *cf.* 9²⁵, 15²⁵, where such aides-de-camp are named.

3. *And four men there were, lepers.* For the disease see Comm., 5¹. **4.** *Let us fall away to the camp of Aram;* the verb is used technically of desertion, change of parties, *e.g.*, 1 Sam. 29³. **6.** For the panic (Lat., 'terror panicus') Grotius gives Classical examples. *The kings of the Hittites and the kings of the Musrites.* So the latter *n. pr.* is to be understood as of the Anatolian Muşur-land, *vs.* K̄r., Mişraim, 'Egypt' (its *kings* would be an absurdity); see I. 10^{28f.}, and for the Hittites *v. ibid.* In Biblical use this name largely denotes Syrian states of one-time Hittite appurtenance, *e.g.*, Josh. 1⁴, Jud. 1²⁶, 2 Sam. 24⁶, while in Assyrian usage Hatti-land meant Syria-Palestine; see KAT 189; A. Götze, *Hethiter, Churriter u. Assyrer* (1936); E. O. Forrer, 'The Hittites in Palestine,' QS 1936, 190 ff.; PEQ 1937, 100 ff.; the last-named scholar has full discussion of use of 'Hittites' in ancient records. He holds (pt. I, 197) that the author of the present story was unaware of the historical circumstances of such a siege of Samaria by Ben-Hadad, since during the whole of this period the 'Hittite' kings were allied with that king against Shalmaneser III (see his Annals for years 853, 848, 843, 841). However, we can hardly control the shifting politics of the Syrian states in that age; *cf.* the varying relations of Israel with Damascus in the present stories and the novel factors and events presented for a later day in the Zakar stele (see above, I. 20¹). For the hiring of auxiliaries—typical at large of ancient military politics—*cf.* 2 Sam. 10⁶, Hos. 8⁹, Is. 7²⁰. **9.** *If we should wait till the morning light, penalty will overtake us:* Grotius remarks: "Officium civium est ea indicare quæ ad salutem publicam pertinent." *Let us go and notify the king's house:* so rather than *household* with EVV; Šanda *cf.* a corresponding Egyptian expression as surrogate for

'king'; cf. Turkish, 'the Porte,' etc. **13.** A lengthy duplicate appears in this v., one lacking in many MSS and also in the Grr. and §; it may be explained by supposing that the scribe of some archetype inadvertently repeated the last line of a column at the top of the next. There also remain problems of interpretation, which have been variously attempted (see Note): the following presents a reduction to simple form. *And one of his courtiers replied and said: And (yet) let them take, pray, five of the horses that are left—those left in it [i.e., in the city—Grr., here], see! will be (in any case) like all the multitude who are already consumed.* Such is Josephus's interpretation of the courtier's suggestion to his master's fear of losing more men (Marcus's tr.): "and, he added, if others are captured by the foe and put to death, you will (merely) be adding the horsemen to those who have already perished in the famine"; i.e., five more lost will make no difference. The present is a typical case of the popular broken diction appearing in these stories, and so most difficult to render. **14.** *And they took two horse-chariots:* Grr., and so Josephus on v.¹³, with change in vocalization, understand 'two riders of horses,' which is preferred by some critics, e.g., Burney, on the ground that reconnoitering is much better done by mounted men; but equestrianism was not a common art in those days; see Note, I. 1⁵. **17.** *And the king having appointed the captain, etc., in charge of the gate, the people trod him down by the gate:* so the usual English translation is to be revised. *As the man of God spoke, who spoke when the king came down to him:* omit the doublet, *who spoke*; Stade, Šanda preserve only the first sentence, regarding the rest as secondary along with the foll. vv. **19. 20.** This extraordinary repetition of vv.^{16. 17} has been explained as the writer's moralizing reiteration for emphasis (so e.g., Thenius, Keil); but is now generally recognized as a secondary doublet; cf. v.¹³.

25. והוא: 4 MSS deR., והוא; but see above, v.²⁰.—בשמינים: MS 30 בהמשים=Grr., §^H (cf. Int., §2).—הריונים (so Ginsb.¹, BH; Ginsb.², הרי ונים; also MSS הריונים) Kt.; רָקִינִים (Cod. C of BH ריב ונים) K̄r.: for ה' cf. הריהו 18²⁷. K̄r. may be explained from J. Aram. ריקא, 'flux'=Heb. ויב, but the word would be no less cacophonous; see Gordis, *The Biblical Text*, 84, for such correction of obscene words.—**27.** אַל: despite the accentuation in אַל=ע, Grr., Jos. ("he imprecated a curse upon her"), it is the exclamatory

negative, 'No!'; cf. 3¹³, etc.: Ψ correctly, "Non te salvet Dominus"; Moff. translates: "'No, . . . may the Eternal help you!'" \S om. Most modern interpreters (so GV FV EVV) follow ancient models, finding here conditional syntax with jussives; see Dr., *Tenses*, §152, 3, Burn. (*n.b.* their doubt in this case). Jos.'s interpretation, followed by St., puts a low damnation in the king's mouth.—29. At end of v. \S^L a plus.—30. עבר: \S^L as though עטר, largely accepted by critics since Klost.; rather Lucian has introduced a literary variation of עבר, v. 26.—31. For the curse formula see I. 2²³.—בן שבע: \S om.; but the full name is here formally proper.—32. בטרם: \S^L \S Ψ with conj., 'and.'—הראיתם: for the irregular dagesh in ר after the particle cf. 1 Sam. 10²⁴, 17²⁵; it doubtless presents actual pronunciation; deR. notes some 'most accurate MSS,' also prints, that avoid it.—33. הזלך: read הזלך; see Comm.

Ch. 7. 1. שמשו: Grr. as sing., accepted by St., *BH*; but the proclamation is to the public in quite democratic fashion.—2. למך: read הזלך with some 10 MSS deR., VSS, and so Then., *al.*—את איש האלהים: \S \S^H 'Elisha,' \S om.; to be elided, specification of the object is not necessary, and above, Elisha is always named.—הנה: for the conditional use of the particle cf. Lev. 13⁵, etc. (the cases cited in GB); König, *Syntax*, 564, denies the conditional use of the particle; it doubtless introduces an exclamatory expression, but in cases with resultant conditional sense; cf. Arab. 'inna, 'in.—עשה: Šanda attempts, "Lo, ὕμῳν has made (עשה) . . . but will this thing happen?"—2⁰: Grr. + 'Elisha.'—4. For the conditional pfs. cf. 5²⁰.—נהיה: 3 MSS ו'= \S \mathcal{T} , approved by St., *BH*; but then the pf. is demanded, as in the foll. conditional phrase.—5. בנשף: 'at (evening) twilight,' cf. v. 7 and so \S understands, *εν τω σκοτει*, in both cases; but \S^L here + $\eta\delta\eta$ *διαυγάζοντος*, in v. 7 + $\eta\delta\eta$ *διαφωσκοντος*, understanding the morning twilight; for contrasted mngs. of נשף see Lexx., and cf. Mt. 28¹, Luke 23⁵⁴, where the verb *επιφωσκειν* renders a similar Aram. *double entente*; see G. F. Moore, *JAOS* 26 (1905), 323 ff.—ויבאו: 7 MSS om., and so the underlying text of Hex. with \times .—קצה: B A *al.*, by perversion, *εις μεσον*; B^a.b \S^L *al.*, *εις μερος* = \S^H .—6. ארני: 14 MSS יהוה; the \mathcal{K} r., replacing the original Kt., seemed a necessary theological change here.—את [מהנה]: 20 MSS אל.—For the 'abenteuerliche Konstruktion' of 'ein so stumpfsinniger Übersetzer' of the Gr. here see Rahlfs, *SS* 3, 223.—קול [סוף]: so Bär, Ginsb., *BH*; many MSS, edd. (Mich., Ken.), וקול = VSS (see deR., Bär), probably to be preferred with St.; the chariot and the horse are summed up in the foll. appositive, 'a great army.'—קול [חיל] = \S (B i), \mathcal{T}^W ; MSS וקול = other VSS.—מלך [ישראל]: N *al.* om., \S^H \times ; acc. to St. a verbal expansion—an unnecessary judgment.—ההיים: Jos., 'the isles,' by confusion of the word with ברים; cf. Jer. 2¹⁰.—קצרים: read תקצרים; see Comm. \mathcal{T} Ψ read as 'המ', 'the Egyptians.'—7. את אלהים ואת כוטיהם ואת חטריהם מהנה.

(and so EVV here, *host*), as well as 'camp'; cf. I. 22³⁴, etc.—15. מלאה בנרים : the appositional syntax is usual with this adj.; see Lexx., and cf. GK §131.—בהרפום : Kt., בקפום Kṛ. : grammatical variants, Nif. and Kāl.—17. וימת : some Gr. MSS om., שׁוּ ✱ ; but not a 'scribal expansion,' as with St.; scribes may have dramatically omitted the item in anticipation of v.²⁰.—אשר דבר : see Comm.—19. כדבר : many MSS, edd. (see deR.) = ט שׁ הירבר = v.².—20. לו [ויחי] : OGrr. om.

81-6. The story of the lady of Shunem continued (4^{8ff.}); her sojourn in the Philistine land upon the prophet's advice to avoid a seven-years' famine having entailed dispossession of her estate, she makes appeal to the king at the moment that Gehazi, in response to his interest in Elijah's *great works*, is telling him the story of the resuscitation of the woman's son; the king orders restoration to her of the estate and its usufruct. The item of a seven years' famine parallels that of the famine in the Elijah cycle, extending into the third year. This extraordinary period of time may have been suggested by the great famine in Canaan and Egypt as narrated in Gen. 41 ff. But a legal *nuance* may lie in the item; at the end of the story the woman recovers her property, *i.e.*, within a sabbatic period, during which she retained her rights of possession despite non-occupation (cf. Ex. 21², 23^{10f.}). Such continuance of possession is illustrated by the story of Ruth. It is futile to attempt chronology for the story, as does Šanda. The woman was a widow now, and her son evidently a minor.
3. *She went out to cry to the king*: legalistic terminology; cf. Akk. *ragāmu* and Lat. *clamare* used in the same sense.
4. 5. The king's interest is quite natural, whatever estrangement there may have been between him and Elisha; the woman's appearance on the scene is a dramatic element.
6. *The king gave her an officer*, etc.: so EVV; but the original sense of *eunuch* (see 18¹⁷) may be preferred here for propriety's sake when a man accompanied a lady.

VV.⁷⁻¹⁵. Upon a visit of Elisha to Damascus the invalid king Ben-Hadad deposes a certain Hazael to inquire of him concerning his recovery; YHWH gives Elisha the vision of Hazael as future king of Aram and desolator of Israel; Hazael returns to his master, on the morrow suffocates him, and assumes the throne. In Shalmaneser III's Bull inscription (846 B.C.) is recorded a victory over Ben-Hadad of Damascus;

in his Obelisk inscription (842 B.C.) appears a victory over Hazael of Damascus; and according to the Berlin inscription (without date) is record of an invasion into Syria with the datum: "Bir-idri forsook his land (*i.e.*, abdicated), and Hazael, son of a nobody, seized the throne."¹ As such a base-born man Hazael appears here, without patronymic (*cf.* Omri, Zimri); evidently the official news to the public was that Ben-Hadad had abdicated. The present story succeeds as fulfilment the oracles of political import from God to Elijah in I. 19^{15ff.}, and is generally regarded as a mere doublet to the latter. But the connexion of those oracles with Elijah is secondary, 'ad majorem gloriam suam,' in contrast with the details of the present story, extraordinary as it is. Most novel is the intrusion of this early prophet into foreign affairs (and yet *cf.* the Balaam oracles), so anticipating Amos and his successors, for in the present case there is no religious, domestic *motif*, as in the denunciation of Ahab's house and the subsequent prophetically inspired revolt of Jehu; indeed Elisha is given, to his own consternation, an oracle portending doom to YHWH's own people. *N.b.* his phrase, "YHWH has given me vision" (vv.^{10.13}), as in the repeated oracles of Amos (ch. 7). Judgment of historicity depends upon the critic's view of the possibility of such second-sight, as also of the elements of actual history lying behind all these narratives. Absurd indeed appears the item of the extra gift of forty camel loads of the best of Damascene wares (v.⁹); v.¹² may be imitative of Hos. 10¹⁴. But the psychical episode in vv.^{10.11} cannot be passed over as pure invention. There arises the query, Did Elisha deliberately lie?, and again, Was he, if not the instigator, at least the suggestor of Hazael's foul act? Some would hold that Elisha was deliberately playing a part in foreign politics,² and even attribute Hazael's crime to

¹ See Rogers, *CP* 297 ff.; Gressmann, *ATB* I, 341 ff.; *ARA* I, §§681, 686. For the contemporary Syrian history, in addition to the *Histoires au courant*, see Šanda, 2, 49 ff.; R. de Vaux, 'La chronologie de Hazaël et de Benhadad III, rois de Damas,' *RB* 43 (1934), 512 ff.; A. Alt, 'Die syrische Staatenwelt vor dem Einbruch der Assyrer,' *ZDMG* 1934, 233 ff. Note Josephus's statement that these two kings were still worshipped as gods in his day.

² So Winckler in *KAT* 248 ff., 254 ff. alleging close relations of Elijah and Elisha with foreign states.

Elisha's 'instigation.' But a warning word by P. Volz is to the point : ³ "Es war eine der einseitigsten Ueberschätzungen der politischen Werte, als man auf den Einfall kam, die Propheten zu 'politischen Agenten' zu machen ; nicht bloss das Selbstgefühl der Propheten, auch das Urteil der auswärtigen Könige über die Propheten und die ganze Stellung der Pneumatiker zu allen Zeiten beweist, dass die Gottesmänner als überweltliche Faktoren anerkannt wurden. Die darüber erzählenden Legenden beruhen auf richtiger Erfahrung." On p. 39, n. 1, he cites Catharine of Siena's concern with affairs of ecclesiastical and imperial politics. It is easy enough forsooth to imagine an international religious conspiracy, like that of the Muslim Assassins, involving the dynasties of Ben-Hadad and Omri.

10. *And Elisha said to him : Go, say to him, Thou shalt surely recover* [Heb. *live*].—*And YHWH has given me to see that he shall surely die.* The contradiction and the apparent falsehood have induced a spelling in \mathfrak{H} , whereby the vocable pronounced *ló* is shifted from the sense *to him* to *not*, i.e., *thou shalt not die* ; but the Hebrew cantillation, as also the VSS, demand the first rendering. Many comm. (see Poole) down to Keil have argued for the second interpretation to avoid the lying contradiction, while the lawyer Grotius bluntly affirms that it is legitimate to lie to aliens and idolators. There is large variety of ancient evasion of the text : Jos., "he bade him not to announce evil to the king" ; Rashi : "according to Hazael's word he said, Thou shalt not die" (i.e., H. was the liar) ; Kimchi : "he will not die unless he is killed." AV dilutes with "Thou mayest certainly recover." The present writer finds two distinct elements in the response : first the prophet's own spontaneous response, which is followed and contradicted by a supervening affect of second-sight. The prophet does not always know at first, or knows only in part (e.g., 4^{26ff.}, 5²⁶) ; cf. the progressive revelations in Amos 7¹⁻⁹, in which the prophet is finally overruled.

11. EVV : *And he settled his countenance steadfastly* [RVV JV +upon him], *until he was ashamed ; and the man of God wept.* The Heb. of *he settled his face* [the verb=*made to stand*] is unique ; the adv. *steadfastly* is circumlocutory for an

³ *Der Geist Gottes*, 40, n. 2.

actual verb, *and he set* (as in AV mg.). These difficulties are increased by the query as to the subject of the verbs. Jewish comm., many Renaissance scholars, most moderns continue Elisha (*cf.* v.¹⁰) as subject; but Josephus, G^{L} (with 'the gifts' as object of 'he set'), Winckler, Stade make Hazael the subject, since *the man of God* is introduced subsequently as subject of *wept*. But we should expect the change of subject to be noted here. Burney understands the moment with "Elisha looked him out of countenance," *i.e.*, *to the shame* of Hazael's guilty conscience; but Elisha was little concerned with the latter's coming crime. Rather (so *e.g.*, Skinner, Šanda) Elisha *stared* (=Heb. *set his face*), overcome by a fresh vision of Israel's approaching misfortune at Hazael's hand. The verb *and he set*, with change of Mas. punctuation is to be emended to *and he was confused* (so V and many moderns), and the following *unto shame* (so the Heb.) may be expressed with 'to mutual embarrassment.' Then a fresh moment follows: *And the man of God wept, i.e.*, he broke down. **12.** Elisha is overwhelmed by the presentiment of what Hazael's accession will mean to Israel. **13.** *What is thy servant, the dog* (as he is)? The phrase has its exact replica repeated in the Lachish ostraca, "Who is thy servant, a dog?"; see Torczyner, *LL* nos. ii, v, vi, and p. 39, noting the similar ancient epistolary form of humility in the Amarna letters, *e.g.*, Knudtzon, no. 60: "I am a slave (*arad*) of the king and a dog (*kalbu*) of his house," and similar interrogative expressions as here, nos. 71, ll. 16 ff., 202, ll. 12 ff. *Cf.* also 1 Sam. 24¹⁵, 2 Sam. 9⁸, 16⁹. **15.** The noun translated *coverlet* is otherwise unknown. Ewald (*HI* 4, 93) has a unicum of rendering, giving the verb *he took* an impersonal subject—some one smothered him with a *bath-cloth*, and listing a number of historic cases of assassination in the bath, *e.g.*, the murder of the prince Aristobulos by Herod (*Ant.*, xv, 3, 3). Thenius gives a long explanation, according to which the king died not from suffocation but from shock.

VV.¹⁶⁻²⁴. The reign of Jehoram of Judah. || 2 Ch. 21; *cf.* *Ant.*, ix, 5. The moralizing judgment upon the king as worthy son-in-law of Ahab and Jezebel (v.¹⁸) is supported by a tradition in Ch. of his having done away with six of his brothers, who are all named, doubtless a historical item. The change

of political conditions in his reign continues the failure of his father Jehoshaphat's effort at Esyon-geber (I. 22⁴⁹); and the revival of Moab under Mesha is paralleled by the similar restoration of Edom to independence and by the revolt of Libnah on the Philistine border. Ch. has a further datum of a successful and destructive invasion by Philistines and Arabs. The appearance of the Assyrians in the north had given signal for revolt to the southern dependencies of the two kingdoms.

16. *Jehoshaphat being king of Judah*: to be omitted, with MSS and VSS, as a dittograph; see Note. **17.** *Jehoram reigned eight years*: the figure varies in 1 Heb. MS and in Gr. texts, as result of varying calculations. **18.** *The daughter of Ahab as wife*: Athaliah, named in v.²⁶ as daughter of Omri. Cf. I. 22⁴⁵ for the 'peace' made between Jehoshaphat and Ahab, and II. 3 for their subsequent joint campaign against Moab. VV.²⁰⁻²² present the only events of the reign. The one is the revolt of Edom, which *in his days revolted from the control of Judah and made a king over themselves* (v.²⁰), a statement repeated after the obscure v.²¹ with *and Edom revolted from the control of Judah* (v.^{22a}); and the other, *Then Libnah revolted at that time* (v. ^{22b}). The expressions 'in his days' and 'then' indicate archival origin for the data.

21. *And Joram [so \mathfrak{H} with reduced form of the name] passed over to Sair and all the chariotry with him; and it was, he rose up by night and smote Edom, who surrounded him, and the captains of the chariotry, and the people fled home* [Heb. *to their tents*—cf. I. 12¹⁶]. The final sentence indicates the flight of the Israelite army, the second and third must mean that by a night foray the king was able to break through the surrounding enemy; but the following 'and the captains of the chariotry,' an accusative, awkwardly introduced in the Heb., is unintelligible, as we learn above only of the Israelite chariotry. The passage must mean in sum that Jehoram himself escaped with the *élite* of his army, and that 'the people,' *i.e.*, the infantry, fled off as best they could. An opposite interpretation by change of text is advanced by Stade (*GVI* 1, 537, n. 1, and *SBOT*—cf. *BH*): *And Edom arose by night, and surrounded him, and smote him and the captains of the chariotry*. But this requires extensive alteration of the text, while the contents of the latter are more suitable to an official

record—there was a heroic sortie. The locality Sair is the Soar of Gen. 13¹⁰, at southern end of the Dead Sea. **22b.** Libnah has not been certainly identified. This autonomous action of a little city is of interest. For the two places see Notes.

VV.²⁵⁻²⁹. The reign of Ahaziah of Judah. || 2 Ch. 22¹⁻⁶; Josephus simply records his accession, *Ant.*, ix, 5 *ad fin.* The usual archival data are given in vv.²⁵⁻²⁶; v.²⁷ is redactorial with its moralizing judgment; vv.^{28, 29} are introductory to the history in ch. 9. **25. 26a.** The king's accession is dated in Joram's 12th year, and his reign given duration of one year. As both kings deceased contemporaneously, the *one year* regarded by a later computer as a full year could not have been such, unless the Judæan king came to the throne in Joram's 11th year, and so the correction of the dating in 9²⁹, accepted here by some VSS. As Kittel remarks, we have here a case of early attempts to correct synchronisms. **26b.** Athaliah is here daughter of Omri, but according to v.¹⁸ daughter of Ahab. The inconsistency has generally been explained by generalizing 'daughter' as 'granddaughter' (*cf.* I. 15²). But Begrich (*ZAW* 53 [1935], 78 f.) properly insists that we possess here a correct tradition, since the earlier passage conflicts with the possible genealogy. The duplicate expression in v.²⁷, *son-in-law of the house of Ahab*, is generalizing, to establish connexion with that arrant evil-doer; this was then understood as meaning Ahab's son-in-law. **28. 29.** Since Ewald (*HI* 4, 97, n. 3) the statement that Ahaziah *went with Joram ben Ahab to war against Hazael*, etc., has been denied by some scholars; in the issue of Joram's disaster (v.²⁹) nothing is said of Ahaziah's fortunes, and the latter appears only in a visit to Joram. Ewald emends with excision of a particle to *Joram went to war*, and this has been accepted by Benzinger, Kittel in his *Comm.*; but the latter in *GVI* 2, 261, and the historians in general accept the Heb. item as historical. However, these two vv. appear to be quite secondary to 9^{14, 15a, 16b}; *n.b.* their repetitiousness, and also the quite anticipatory reference to Ahaziah's visit; see below, *int.* to cc. 9, 10.

1. גא : ppl. used verbally; *cf.* הָלַךְ, Gen. 32⁷ (for similar use in Syriac *cf.* Nöld., *Syr. Gram.*, §274); ⚡ as perf., and so St.; ⚡¹ a doublet with future verb.—3. פִּלְשְׁתִּים : B j u x + ' to the city.'

—והנצא : Hex. , S as והנצא, preferred by St. (*cf. BH*), on the ground that the woman was not yet in her house; but the verb here is legalistic.— 2^0 3^0 : על is demanded, as in v.⁸.—5. המת : MS 171 pref. בנה ; Grr., 'a (her) dead son.'—6. מיום עוקה : יום is conj. of time, as in Ps. 56⁴, etc., and so in Ugaritic, S. Arab.; hence the infin., לעוקה, is not required, *vs. St.*, Šanda, *BH*.—8. הוואל : so thrice below and 2 Ch. 22⁶, also in an Aram. docket on an Akk. tablet (see GB, and *cf. עינהאל*); elsewhere הוואל (so 11 MSS here). Thureau-Dangin has published an ivory tablet with text לבראן הוואל, *Arslan-Tash* (1931), 88.—גנהה : Grr., $\mu\alpha\nu\alpha\alpha$, etc., exc. S^L , also Jos., $\delta\omega\pi\alpha$; similar transliteration in S 17⁸, 20¹²: the foreign word may have entered Hellenistic usage.—מאורו : read with 6 MSS, one early ed., מאורו, and so Kt. in very many MSS and some early edd.; see deR.—מחלי : 'from my sickness'; see Note, 1².—9. וכל : S^L C S as מכל ; St. rightly prefers H , as distinguishing the gift carried by the envoy and the goods borne after him.—10. לא : 18 MSS : S : of Grr. B i om. *al.* Grr., VSS= S ; the case is one of 18 in which tractate *Sopherim*, vi, 5, insists that לא is to be read for לו ; see König, *Syntax*, §352, b.—והראני : for the unusual consecution (this case apparently not noted by grammarians and by comm. *ad loc.*) *cf. Dr., Tenses*, ch. 9; the unusual syntax may mark an abrupt opposition of thought='and yet.'—11. ויפטר את פניו וישם ער בש : S (B A N *al.*) κ . παρεστη τω προσωπω αυτου κ . εθηκεν εως αισχυνης : S^L develops the implication : εστη Αζαηλ κατα προσωπον αυτου (= S^H "and A. stood before his face") κ . παρεθηκεν ενωπιον αυτου τα δωρα εως ησχυνετο ; for the last phrase MSS 71 h u z, εκειτο τα δωρα εως ου εσαπισσαν (*i.e.*, as=root באש)= L "posita sunt munera usque dum putrida fierent," this variant appearing also in S^H as a doublet; T "and he turned his face and delayed for long"; S om.; V "stetitque cum eo et conturbatus est usque ad suffusionem vultus." Read וישם with Klost., Benz., Kit. (*but cf. BH*), Šanda; see Burn., St. to the contrary.—12. רעה=Grr. in general; A om.= C ; S^L $\sigma\tau$; its construction as acc. is defended by Ew., *Syntax*, §333, understanding את אשר as 'how,' as at I. 19¹.—תשלה : see Moore on Jud. 1⁸, proposing 'get rid of by fire.'—14. לי : S^H ✱, depending upon a text with haplog. of ειπεν, ειπεν ; *cf. variants in Gr. MSS.*—15. הזכבר : 4 MSS pref. את ; T and S tr. with their respective words for שחיבה, 'rug,' Jud. 4¹⁸; S^L στρωμα= V MSS 'stragulum,' 'bed-cover'; S S^H S^H transliterate with much corruption entailed, *e.g.*, B A; Jos. tr. with δίκτυον, 'net.' 16. מלך יהודה : מלך יהושפט מלך יהודה : MSS 30 253 Ken. (*cf. 380 deR.*) om., and so Grr. (exc. B A S^L), also S A , and many codices of V ; see Ken., *Diss.*, §89, deR. for the Latin texts, and *SBOT*; the V is otherwise badly corrupted in Heb. MSS. Mahler (*Chronologie*, 287) regards the item as noting a case of associated kingship.—יהורם Occ., יורם Or. : *inf.* יורם.—יהודה : 2^0 : the formula hitherto 'מ' על ' ; the change continues hereafter, exc. at 9²⁹ (Šanda).—

17. שמונה: MS 224 עשר; B A d₂ '40' (obtained by addition, 32+8); Ⓢ^L '10'; *al.*, Jos.= Ⓢ .—שנה= Ⓢ .—K r . ענינים=Kt. in 22 MSS, edd.=Ch.; the same anomaly (see St.'s note) in 14², 22¹; *cf.* GK §134, e; the original was prob. written in abbreviation.—18. בדרך: 1 MS deR. בדרך=pl. in Ⓢ Ⓢ . מלכי: A N *al.* as sing.—19. לו 10: Ⓢ Ⓢ^L om.; 1 Heb. MS om. לו 20.—לניו: *ca.* 60 MSS, also edd. (Bār), לוניו A *al.*, Ch.; B om. (Ⓢ has); N *al.*= Ⓢ . St., Šanda well sugg. rdg. לפניו=I. 11³⁶.—21. צעירה='little,' and the place identical with צער of Gen. 13¹⁰, both being forms of orig. diminutive, Arab. *suğair*; *cf.* the writer's note on 'Delilah' as an orig. diminutive, *JQR* 25 (1935), 262. The etymology in Gen. 19^{20, 22} is correct, despite Buhl, *Edomiter*, 65, denying it on ground of Gr. gamma for the gutt. in Gen., but here $\Sigma\epsilon\upsilon\omega\pi$; but such transliteration is not constant; see Speiser, *JQR* 23 (1923), 236. St. would correct to צערה; Hitzig identified with צעיר. Ch. here עם שריו.—'עם שריו הוא קם ונ'': Burn. regards the construction as 'inexplicable.' For the v. see Stade-Haupt's full discussion, also Robinson, *HI* 1, 343.—לילה: Ⓢ (B Ⓢ^H Ⓢ^L) om.—'ואת שריו הרבב . . . ויבה את ארום': in suit with one interpretation noted above, the rdg. ויבה ארום, or 'ארום ויבה' is claimed; Kit. would read ויבה ארום, 'and with him,' but St. observes that then ויעמו is demanded.—The 'fleeing to their tents,' *i.e.*, fleeing home, is generally misunderstood. Ch., ignoring the defeat, om. this item.—22. לקנה: Gr. variously; Ⓢ^L $\Lambda\omicron\beta\upsilon\alpha$ = Ⓢ , representing a place identified in the *Onom.*; see Döllner, *GES* 252 ff.; Albr., *BASOR* 15 (1924), 9; Abel, *GP* 2, 369 f.—25. שתיים עשרה: Ⓢ^L Ⓢ '11th,' correction agreeing with 9²⁹.—שנה: 11 MSS, edd. om.—מלך יהודה: OGr. om.—26. '22 years': Ch., '42,' where Ⓢ '20.'—עתליו: the verbal root=Akk. *etelu/etelu*, 'to be manly,' the derivative noun being used as epithet of gods; see Bezold, *BAG* 25, Noth, *IP* 191; *un. pr.* עתל, occur in Thamudene, *NPS* 1, 172.—בירושלם: B A y Ⓢ 'in Israel.'—[בת] עמרי: Ⓢ^L 'Ahab.'—27. כי תתן בית אהאב הוא: Ⓢ om., Ⓢ^H Ⓢ^L .—28. [את] יורם: 10: MS 70 om.; see Comm.—ארם: Ⓢ (B A N *al.*) $\alpha\lambda\lambda\omicron\phi\upsilon\lambda\omega\upsilon\varsigma$.—רבח: Ⓢ^L $\rho\alpha\mu\alpha\theta$; in v.²⁹ רמה; see Note, I. 4¹³.—ארמים: Ch., הרמים, and Gr. there *οι τοξοται*, a rdg. accepted here by St.=הרמים: Klost., Burn. propose הרמים, 'the archers'; the subj. may be pure gloss, but is supported by 9¹⁵.—29. יכהו: so 9¹⁵; read with Ch. הרקו; primitive error by confusion of ה and ו.—ארמים: Ⓢ om., Ⓢ^H Ⓢ^L ; it is superfluous, but the whole passage is repetitious.—מלך יהודה: MS 114, Ⓢ om.—בן אהאב: Gr. v om., Ⓢ^H Ⓢ^L .

9-10²⁸. The prophet-inspired revolt against Ahab's dynasty; the success of Jehu, with the extermination of Ahab's family and the devotees of Baal, and accompanying murder of Ahaziah of Judah. || 2 Ch. 22⁷⁻⁹; *cf.* *Ant.*, ix, 6. For the historical circumstances see the Histories of Israel, and for the popular character of the revolution Causse, *Du groupe*

ethnique, ch. 3. The narrative belongs to a practically contemporary document, coming from the school of the prophets, with full *sub voce* approval of the revolt and Jehu's bloody deeds. There is no hint of the blame that was later cast upon the usurper as in 10^{29ff.}, Hos. 1⁴. As an objective and highly dramatic political history, with which criticism can find little fault, the narrative naturally suggests literary comparison with I. 20, 22, and such is the general opinion of critics, e.g., Wellhausen (*Comp.*, 286 f.), Kittel, Stade. Šanda disputes this position on the ground that the political attitude of the two documents is not identical, a favour being shown to Ahab in the earlier document that is not exhibited here. And yet the political favour of religious groups varies according to circumstances; the school of the prophets was loyal to Ahab, for he made concessions to their position (e.g., I. 18), which were doubtless ruthlessly withdrawn by the queen-mother Jezebel, the power behind the throne of her two sons. However the present document does not depend upon the earlier one for style or details; e.g., 9²⁵ with its cryptic indirect allusion is absolutely original, as is 'yesterday' in v.²⁶, while there is a different formulation of Elijah's word (9²⁶) from that in I. 21²⁹, and also I. 21²³ is secondary to the full oracle given here, 9^{36, 37}. We may not claim more than that the two histories come from a common literary tradition, and, if indeed from different composers, light is cast upon a remarkable culture inspired in and by the early prophets, with which we may best compare the court-history of David and Solomon. Another contemporary document of quite similar colour is the story of the Judæan revolt against Athaliah (ch. 11), from a writer of the same *milieu*, although a Judæan. The present history with its long sweep of lively detail is the most dramatic in Kings. Note Jehu's evasiveness (v.¹⁹), the obscure reminiscence, *Remember—I and thou* (v.²⁵), the dialogue with the proud, taunting Jezebel through her lattice window, a scene vivified to us by archæology (vv.^{30ff.}), the meeting with the otherwise undescribed Jehonadab b. Rechab, yet well enough known in his day, and their giving hands in zeal for YHWH (10^{15ff.}), the wily stratagem for discovering the servitors of Baal (vv.^{18ff.})—all these are as humanly true and brutal sketches as can be found anywhere in history, and all done with lightning-like strokes.

The document has been but slightly interpolated. 9^{7-10a}, placed in the young prophet's mouth, is an intrusion, disturbing the connexion. The parenthesis, vv. 15a. 16b, appears like repetition of 8^{28. 29}, and is generally regarded as secondary to the latter (*e.g.*, by Stade, Šanda); but Kittel well makes the point that here is the original datum which has been repeated above (*v. ad loc.*). *N.b.* the archival phrase (v. 14), and *Jehu ben Jehoshaphat ben Nimshi conspired against Joram*, etc., with which *cf.* the identical phrase used of Zimri (I. 16⁹); the definite phrase, *Joram was defending* [Heb. *guarding*—unique military term] *Ramoth-Gilead*, *vs.* the generalizing *went to war with Hazael* in the earlier statement. Indeed it looks as though the present passage stood originally at the beginning of the ch.; then a variant form arose to conclude Ahaziah's history, after which, the prophet's action being given first place, the item was intruded here parenthetically. 9²⁹ is an intruded variant repetition of 8²⁵ (*v. ad loc.*). The one historically dubious passage, as recognized even by conservative critics, *e.g.*, Kittel, Šanda, following Stade (*ZAW* 1885, 275 ff.), is the story of the massacre of the brothers of Ahaziah going down to *inquire after the health* [Heb. *peace*] *of the king's children and the queen-mother's children, some forty-two men* (10¹²⁻¹⁴). The large number refers to the whole accompanying party (but *cf.* the same number for the naughty children in 2²¹); the country-wide fame of Jehu's insurrection and bloody massacres would seem to render the anecdote of such a visit most absurd; and yet the details can hardly have been invented. The passage may be out of historical order. There is no reason to doubt, with Stade, the historicity of the Jehonadab anecdote (10^{15. 16}).

9¹⁻¹⁶. The consecration of Jehu as king by prophetic commission; his recognition by the army at Ramoth-Gilead; his immediate drive to Jezreel with stern instructions that no news should go out from the citadel. A prophet once more appears as the actor in consecration of a new king; so Samuel was the consecrator of Saul (1 Sam. 10), of David (*ib.* ch. 16), and Nathan along with the priest Sadok of Solomon (I. 1^{34. 39}). 2. Jehu's genealogy is given here and in v. 14 (the original source) as *ben Jehoshaphat ben Nimshi*. 4. Omit *the young man, the prophet*, a gloss introduced to correct the possible

notion that the messenger was merely a *boy* (*na'ar*), by which term however is meant a junior member of the guild. **11. 12.** *This mad fellow* : from the name of a raving order of Mesopotamian priests, *maḥḥū*, was derived an adverb, *maḥḥūtiš* = 'like a madman'; see Bezold, *BAG* 167, and Albright, *From the Stone Age*, 232. Jehu's embarrassment is well depicted: *You know for yourselves the man and his prattle*, correctly interpreted by Junius, "Scitis quid prophetæ loqui soleant." Ehrlich takes it in the sense, "You may know, but I do not." **13.** The strewing of the garments under the new king is paralleled by the story of Jesus' triumphal entry into Jerusalem (Mt. 21⁸). The phrase translated in EVV with *on the top of the stairs* (otherwise Moffatt, Chic. B.) is obscure; the word *top* is best understood as some architectural term; see Note. *Jehu is king!*: the same acclamation is given to Deity at his annual accession festival; cf. Gunkel, *Einkl. in die Psalmen*, 94 f. There may be noted the affecting story told by Robinson (*BR* 2, 8) of a time of famine at Bethlehem, when a British official party was welcomed by the people with their strewing of garments in the way and their asking for protection. For the trumpets cf. the discovery of a pair of silver trumpets in Tutankhamen's tomb (*ILN* Apr. 15, 1939, 633). For vv.^{14. 15a. 16b} see above. VV.^{15b. 16a. 17-28}. Jehu drives rapidly to Jezreel, and slays the two kings who come to meet him. This long drive of Jehu's squadron raises the interesting problem of ancient chariot transportation. The obscure approaching *company*, observed by the sentinel at Jezreel, induces the sending out of mounted scouts, who are roughly detained by Jehu. At last he is recognized by the sentry as Jehu for his furious driving (v.²⁰), the Heb. word for 'fury' being of the same root as that for *mad fellow*, v.¹¹. **21.** For the verb 'to make ready' of the EVV, 'to harness up' is a more exact translation, and for 'they found him,' rather 'they came upon him.' **22.** To Joram's anxious inquiry, *Is all well?* (Heb., *Is it peace?*), comes Jehu's rough answer, as it may best be rendered: *What! Is it all well, with still the many harlotries and witchcrafts of thy mother Jezebel?* These terms, as Kittel remarks, are anticipatory of the language of the canonical Prophets in their description of the renegade practices of Israel; cf. Hos. 2¹⁷, 4⁷, etc. By

witchcrafts are meant the false cults, whose potency was ascribed to evil arts. For similar collocation of such terms see 17¹⁷, 21⁶, Dt. 18¹⁰. 25. *Then he* (Jehu) *said to Bidkar his captain: Take up and cast him in the portion of the field of Naboth the Jezreelite, for remember how that, when I and thou rode together after Ahab his father, YHWH pronounced this burden upon him* [RVV^{mg}—*uttered this oracle against him*]. This moment gives stout authentication in its indirectness to the oracle put in Elijah's mouth in the sequel to Ahab's seizure of Naboth's vineyard (I. 21^{17ff.}). The prophet indeed is not named, as would be the case were the data here secondary; and the cryptic reminiscence shared in by Jehu and Bidkar is doubtless original although the text is obscure. The translation of this half-verse as given above (and so Moffatt, Chic. B., but with 'I remember'), does not exhibit the difficulties of \mathfrak{H} , for which and for the many variant renderings see Note; but, as Šanda remarks, "the syntax is broken in correspondence with the excitement of the scene," and we may not proceed lightly to correction. The original of Engl. *rode together* can literally and best be translated, *were driving teams, i.e., each in his own chariot*. For the word properly translated *burden* in EVV see Gehman, "The 'Burden' of the Prophets," *JQR* 31 (1940), 107 ff., demonstrating that such is the proper *nuance* of the word—a burden upon the prophet, to be unloaded upon the guilty object. 27. The place *Beth-haggan* (EVV literally, *the garden house*) is identified with En-gannim of Josh. 19²¹, 21²⁹, the modern Jenin; see Smith, *HG* 356; Döller, *GES* 254; Abel, *GP* 2, 317. Jibleam is modern Bel'ameh, a ruined tower S of Jezreel (Döller, *ib.*, 255). For *the ascent of Gur* the name may survive in modern Gurra (Sellin, *Tell Ta'annek*, 102). As EVV show by their parentheses, a sentence carrying out Jehu's order, *Smite him also*, is desiderated; following the Grr. and with slight emendation of \mathfrak{H} read: *And him too! And they* [Grr. sing.] *smote him*. The following *on the chariot* is evidently a gloss meant to be attached to the verb *they drove him* in v.²⁸ (where the EVV actually expand with *they carried him in a chariot*); so Stade, Šanda, *cf. BH*. The fate of Ahaziah is expanded in 2 Ch. 22^{7ff.} with remarkable midrashic variation. V.²⁹. For this intrusion see above.

VV.³⁰⁻³⁷. The fate of Jezebel. **30.** The queen receives the murderer in royal state: *she made up her eyes with paint* [Heb. *pūk*], *and dressed her head, and looked out of the window.* For the drug in question, Gr. *στίμμυ* (the derivative verb being used here in the Grr.), Lat. *stibium*, see W. H. Schoff, *The Periplus of the Erythraean Sea*, 192, with citations from Pliny and Dioscorides, and recalling the case of the Lydian queen Omphalos, who captivated Hercules, and used this cosmetic. In addition to its use for painting the eyebrows it dilates the pupils, and so Jeremiah, addressing the naughty woman Jerusalem, speaks of her as 'tearing out thy eyes' with the stuff (Jer. 4³⁰). The same naughty woman, Oholibah, is described by Ezekiel as 'painting thy eyes' (Eze. 23⁴⁰), the verb used there being of the same root as *koḥl*, the name for the black cosmetic continued in modern Oriental use; see Dalman, *A. u. S.*, 5, 351 ff., claiming that it is properly an antimonoxide. There is further to be noted the article on the Hebrew word *pūk* by W. Sommer in *JBL* 62 (1943), 33 ff., according to which the word had in antiquity quite varying colour-connnotations. For the feminine painting-up in antiquity cf. Enoch 8¹, condemning these alluring arts as coming from Azazel; for the Classical world see Grotius. *And she looked out through the window.* The same was custom for royal audience in Egypt, as represented in pictured scenes; cf. Gressmann, *ATB* 2, 61; Gunkel, *Einl. in die Psalmen*, p. 73; and at length N. J. Reich, *Mizraim I* (1933), 39 f., on the Ptolemaic references to royal audiences 'through the window.'¹

31. Jezebel's salutation is the height of sarcasm: *Is it well (anglice, 'How do you do?'), thou Zimri, his lord's murderer?* The satirical appellative has its Classical parallel in Virgil (*Æneid*, iv, 215, cited by Grotius), "et nunc ille Paris," referring to Æneas. **34.** *And he went indoors, and ate and drank*—as if nothing untoward had happened, as Ehrlich remarks. **35.** The ghastly details of the end of Jezebel's remains are petty, but historical. **36.** The present citation

¹ There is another motive in the ivory tablet of the woman looking through the window found in Samaria (J. W. and G. W. Crowfoot, *The Ivories from Samaria*, 1933, pl. iii, fig. 3), and in the description of the artful woman in Prov. 7^{6a}; see G. Boström, *Proverbiastudien* (1935), 102 ff.

of Elijah's word is the original of I. 21²³. 37. Stade, Šanda regard the v. as 'Ausmalung'; there is indeed no surety in the tradition of the spoken word.

1. פָּר : see Honeyman, *PEQ* 1939, 86.—רָבַח : B $\text{P}\epsilon\mu\mu\alpha\theta$, also v.¹⁴ (from original $\text{P}\epsilon\mu\mu\alpha\theta$, cf. v.⁴) is contamination from Hex.—
2. הַיּוֹא : the name also of an almost contemporary prophet, I. 16¹. S gives interestingly the original pronunciation of the first syllable, *Yāhū*. For the vowel change cf. *Yāsū'* > *Yēsū'*. Noth, *IP* 143, bases the name on the absolutely used *hū* in names, *Abihu, Elihu*, but does not explain the first-syllable. H. Bauer, *Die Ostkanaaner* (1926), 31, would identify the name with Old Ba. *Ya-u-šu*. For such a divine *n. pr.* cf. Hadad, etc.—בֶּן יְהוֹשָׁפָט : B erroneously pref. to 'Jehu'; S om.; there is no reason, as with St. (cf. *BH*) to discredit the genealogy, supported as it is by v.¹⁴.—נַמְשִׁי : cf. Bab. *Numušum* (GB); Noth (p. 230) connects with Arab. *nims*, 'ichneumon'; the name now appears on a Samarian ostracon, *IAE* 47.—חָרַר בְּחָרָר : cf. I. 20³⁰, 22²⁵.—
3. [יִשְׂרָאֵל] : אל : many MSS, edd. correctly by; similar variations in vv.^{12, 13, 14, 27}.—
4. הַנְּעָר הַנְּעָר הַנְּבִיא : 16 MSS deR. om. הַנְּעָר 2⁰ = Grr. exc. B, 'the prophet, the youth'; 2 MSS $\text{T} \text{P}$ 'the boy of the prophet'; see Comm.—
6. אֵל יִשְׂרָאֵל : the duplicative phrase (cf. v.³) is properly preserved by St.—
7. וְהִתְרִיחַ : Grr., κ. ἐξολεθρευσεις . . . ἐκ προσώπου μου (correct σου of B A), i.e., the verb assimilated to v.⁸.—נִקְמַתִּי : Grr., $\text{S}^H \text{S}$ as 2d person, for theological reasons.—וְרָמִי כָל עֲבָרֵי יָ" : with the Deity in the 3d person; Klost., al., properly regard as gloss, with Naboth in mind.—
8. וְאֶבְרָךְ = T^W ; $\text{T}^L \text{S} \text{A} \text{P}$ = וְאֶבְרָךְ, ignoring the syntax; Grr. = וְמִיר, continuing v.⁷, accepted by Klost., St., Ehrl., cf. *BH*; but absolute logic in the passage is not to be demanded.—מִשְׁחֵיךָ : see on I. 14¹⁰.—
9. S^H margin registers here with the letter *Lam.* the first of seven Lucianic rdgs., noted by it, as observed first by Field, *Hex.*, I, pp. lxxxv seq.; cf. Rahlfs, *SS* 3, 30 ff.—
11. וְיֹאמַר : T^W ; ca. 27 MSS וְיֹאמַר = the other VSS; the pl. is expected.—הַשְׁלוֹם : cf. v.³¹, 4²⁶.—מִשְׁנַע : for the root cf. v.²⁰.—שִׂיחוֹ : Grr., τ. ἀδολεσχίαν αὐτοῦ, 'his garrulity'; $\text{T} \text{S}$ 'his conversation'; Aq., Sym. with the noun *δμλία*, 'business'; P 'quid locutus sit'; cf. the verb, I. 18²⁷.—
12. וְיֹאמַר : the plus 'to them' in Grr., P , is spontaneous.—לֹאמַר : St. (cf. *BH*) regards as secondary; but with the preceding indefinite "so and so has he said to me" the speaker's hesitation is presented; Klost. sugg. an interlude.—
13. אֵל נִים : הַמְעִלוֹת : B d₂ ἐπι το γαρ ἐνα τ. ἀναβ., which curiously developed into ἐπι γαρ ἐνα τ. ἀναβ. = Sym., S^H (see Rahlfs, *SS* 3, 223 f., for the Gr. variations); Aq., πρὸς οστῶδες τ. ἀναβ., rendering 'bone': S 'upon the seat of the stairs'; P 'in similitudinem tribunalis,' appearing to depend upon the Aram. use of 'נ' as 'self, the very same,' and so Rashi, 'on the very stairs' (the noun is so used also of inanimate objects in Jewish Aram.),

מה שלום; Grr., "is it peace?" = Ψ ; Υ "what, is it peace?" i.e., מה השלום, which rdg. is to be preferred with St., BH; Klost., Kit. elide ה, translating with 'in friedlicher Absicht?'— Υ : Grr., $\epsilon\tau\iota$, Ψ 'adhuc,' as adverbial, as in Syr., or reading $\epsilon\tau\iota$, which Klost., St. prefer (cf. BH); but rather to be taken, with Ew., *Syntax*, §217, a, as prep., 'during,' cf. Jud. 3²⁶, Jon. 4², etc.—23. ידיו: so pl. by almost unanimous testimony; contrast the same phrase, I. 22³⁴.—24. מלא ידו בקשת: for absence of acc. particle cf. vv.^{30. 32}, and for the expression, 2 Sam. 23⁷, Zech. 9¹³. Haupt ingeniously cft. Akk. *ḫasta ina ḫatišu umalli*, and propose transposition of the prep. to the first noun; but the foreign phrase may have suffered change in translation. Rashi cleverly renders with "he drew the bow with all his strength."—בין ידיו: cf. בין עיניו, Zech. 13⁶, and בן עינא, 'between the eyes,' in an Ugaritic text (Gordon, *Ugar. Handbook*, 2, 68: ll. 22, 25).—25. ברקר: cf. n. pr. ברקר, I. 4⁹, q.v.; ב prob. = בעל (cf. בעשא, etc.), n.b. vocalization in original Gr., Βαδερ, and Jos., Βαδακω (error for Βαδακρω, so Marcus). Origin from בן is also claimed; Šanda cft. Akk. *Bindikiri*, and for such a reduction of בן see F. W. Winnett, *Lihyanite and Thamudic Inscriptions* (Toronto, 1937), 20 ff., arguing for this origin here and in similar Heb. names (BDB 122a).—שא: B A 𐤑 om.—שה: 3 MSS om., and so 𐤑 𐤀 .—זכר אני ואתה: all VSS read ו' as ppl. = "I remember, and so thou," but construction with the following remains broken; 𐤑 improved on 𐤑 with $\mu\epsilon\mu\eta\mu\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\gamma\omega\ \sigma\tau\epsilon\ \epsilon\gamma\omega\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \sigma\upsilon$, inducing in turn modern text-correction, זכר אני כי אני ואתה, (Burn., St., cf. BH); but with Šanda 𐤑 may well be kept: "Remember! I and thou . . ."—את: MS 89 om., all VSS, EVV ignore, of necessity; Rashi makes it a prep. to foll. noun, Kimchi takes it as adverbial, "I with thee, and thou with me"; it may be omitted as dittogr. of אתה with Burn., al., or rather it may be preserved as 'hervorhebendes Partikel,' angl. "there we were," cf. GB 76b.—רכבים צמרים: Grr., $\epsilon\pi\iota\beta\epsilon\beta\eta\kappa\omicron\tau\epsilon\varsigma\ \epsilon\pi\iota\ \zeta\epsilon\upsilon\gamma\eta$ (𐤑 $\zeta\epsilon\upsilon\gamma\omicron\varsigma$, as though צמר) = 𐤑 ; 𐤑 "how we were driving one yoke" (the sing. again); 𐤑 as parallel ppls., "driving and riding" (cf. 𐤀); Ψ abbreviates, "sedentes in curru (sequebamur)"; Rashi, "with (=prec. את) other accompanying (מחבורים as for נקדריים) drivers"; Kimchi renders with "accompanying one another in one chariot" (cf. EVV), interpreting with 'like a pair of oxen.' The simplest translation is that of Stade, as given above, "were driving teams," cf. Haupt, "were teaming." Correction of צ has been suggested: to the pass. ppl., 'paired,' cf. Num. 25⁸ (so Burn., Ehrl., cf. BH); or to the sing., reading in suite מאררי (cf. Kit., Šanda); but the VSS here have no authority.—ויהה וג': n.b. parallelism of nominal clauses, denoting identical circumstances.—משא: Grr., $\lambda\eta\mu\mu\alpha$, by peculiar use in the Gr. Bible, of which A $\rho\eta\mu\alpha$ is corruption.—26. לא: cf. I. 20³⁵.—ושלמתי: Grr., $\kappa.\ \alpha\nu\tau\alpha\pi\omicron\delta\omega\sigma\omega$, 𐤑 also introducing a doublet earlier in the v., $\epsilon\kappa\alpha\delta\iota\kappa\eta\sigma\omega$.—לך: 𐤑 Hex., 'to him.'—שא השלכו: for the sing.

impv. *cf.* v.²¹; Ⓞ^L as pl.—27. בית הַגֶּן: Ⓞ cursives, *Onom.* (Gr. and Lat.) preserve original transliteration, Βαρθαγγαν, etc.; B A N *al.*, Βαρθαν; Ⓞ^L Βαρθωρων, etc.; subsequent VSS tr., 'house of the garden,' EVV 'the garden house.'—וּמֵן אֵתוֹ הַגֶּן: Grr., κ. γε αὐτον κ. επαταξαν αὐτον, following which emend the verbal form to וְקָצְרוּ (Kit., St.); Burn., following Ⓞ, adds this verb after the impv.—אֵל הַמְרֻכְבָּה: for the phrase as a gloss see Comm.; note here the exact Gr. tr. (B), προς τω αρματι, but in v.²⁸ επι το αρμα.—גִּבּוֹר: Grr. MSS corrupt: *Onom.*, Γηρ=Ⓞ^H; Ⓞ 'Gaber'; Ⓞ Ⓞ=Ⓞ.—אִישׁ אֶת יִבְלֵעַ: Grr., "which is Y.," prob. understanding the prep. as Aram. אית; *Onom.* for the prep. εγγυς.—28. עַם אֲבֵהֶוּ: OGrr. om., St. deletes; but there is no control over such details; 1 Heb. MS om. במקרה.—29. Ⓞ^L *ad fin.*+ "and he reigned one year in Jerusalem," repeated from 8²⁶; see Rahlfs, SS 3, 253.—30. וְחָשׂוּ עֵינָיָהּ: *cf.* use of עשה in similar operations, Dt. 21¹², 2 Sam. 19²⁵.—פֶּן: is rendered with root כהל in Ⓞ Ⓞ.—31. בְּשַׁעַר: Grr., εν τη πολει (=Ⓞ^H) as=בעיר, exc. 71⊘.—32. פָּנָיו: MS 180 עֵינָיו=Ⓞ^L Ⓞ.—הִלֵּי: OGrr.+ "and saw her."—מִי אִתִּי: for אתי, 'on my side,' *cf.* 6¹⁶, etc. Grr., τις ει συ καταβηθι μετ εμου=Ⓞ^H, cmdg. as יְשַׁעַר; *cf.* Jos., "he asked who she was, and commanded her to come down." Ⓞ "who is here?" Ⓞ follows Grr., "quæ est ista?" For Klost.'s arbitrary emendation see Burn., St.—שְׁנַיִם שְׁלִישָׁה: for the idiom *cf.* Is. 17⁶; Grr., 'two,' exc. A, 'three.'—33. שָׁמְחוּ, Kt., BH: other edd. שִׂמְחוּ.—וְיִרְמָקָה: the VSS with pl. verb; St. keeps the sing.; most comm. change to pl., ירמסוה (*e.g.*, Burn.); but read ירמקנה, as energetic pl., after Heb. and Ugaritic usage; see RSMT 23 f.—35. בַּה: for the partitive use of the prep. *cf.* Gordon, *Ugar. Handbook*, 3, s.vv. ב, בן.—37. וְקָצְרוּ: poss. with Burn. for original וְקָצְרוּ; *cf.* GK §75, m.—כִּדְבִיץ: *cf.* the possible play on the element zebel observed in Note to I. 16³¹.—הַשְּׂדֵה: 3 MSS Ken., deR., הארמה.—הַזֶּבֶל יִרְעָאֵל: Ⓞ^L om., St. deletes.—אִישׁ לֹא יֵאמְרוּ וְאֵת אִיזְבֵּל: Grr., exc. Ⓞ^L texts, by early corruption, ωστε μη ειπεν αὐτους Ιεζαβελ.—*Ad fin.* Ⓞ^L+ κ. ουκ εσται ο λεγων οϊμοι. Sophocles in his *Lex.* gives, s.v., a fourth-century Patristic citation, οϊμοι τῆν κεφαλῆν, "my head aches!"

10¹⁻¹¹. The slaughter of Ahab's family and court.¹ 1a. *And Ahab having seventy sons in Samaria*—(the clause is syntactically subordinate to the following). Stade argues that the

¹ For criticism of cc. 10–14 see Stade's 'Anmerkungen,' ZAW 5 (1885), 275 ff.=*Akad. Reden*, 181 ff.; and *cf.* his critical apparatus in SBOT. But Meyer criticizes such meticulous criticisms: "Die glänzende Erzählung Reg. II, 9, 10 ist durch einige Zusätze und Fehler entstellt, aber im übrigen durchaus intakt und anschaulich. Es ist sehr verkehrt, wenn man auf Grund einzelner Anstösse und nicht beantwortbarer Fragen, wie sie sich bei jeder Zeugenaussage finden, ihre Zuverlässigkeit bezweifelt hat" (*GA* 2, 2, 338, n.).

sentence is secondary to v.⁷ (which also is an intrusion!), according to which 'the king's sons' (or rather 'the royal princes,' without indication of the father) were 'seventy persons.' However the term 'sons' is generalizing; it can include grandchildren, *e.g.*, 'the seventy souls from Jacob's loins' (Ex. 1⁵). The high figure would indeed better befit the older man, as Šanda argues, calculating Ahab's age at death at about 63 years. But the round figure is probably formulistic, as at Ex. 1⁵, in the 'seventy sons' ascribed to Gideon (Jud. 8³⁰), and in the case of the 'seventy relatives' (with a noun developed from 'āḥ, 'brother') of the Aramaean Panammūwa, who were slain by an usurper as in the present story (line 3 of his inscription). Many of the children were of minor age, *n.b.* 'the Guardians.' **1b.** *Jehu wrote a letter* [Heb. pl., but see I. 21⁸], *and sent it to Samaria*: "To the Commandants 'of the city and to' [so correcting with ⚡ the absurd of Jezreel of ⚡] the Senators [Heb. elders] and to the Guardians [⚡+unsyntactical Ahab, *cf.* EVV; plus saying]. **2a.** *And now*: Upon the coming of this letter to you, etc. This rendering presents the exact form of preface to an ancient letter; the addressee is named first; then the writer, with his title and his salutation, the 'peace'—here omitted, the contents of the letter being then introduced with the formulistic *and now* (*cf.* 5⁶). This phrase, ועתה, appears in a Lachish letter (Torczyner, no. 4, ועתה), and has its Aramaic correspondents, בעתה, בעתה, in the letters cited in Ezra 4⁸, etc., and in the Elephantine letters (Cowley, *Aram. Pap.*, Index). The three legal estates, the military officialdom (*cf.* I. 22²⁶), the civil authorities (*cf.* I. 21⁸), and the guardians of the royal family are addressed, the last category being correctly understood by ⚡ as those who reared the royal children. **2b. 3.** Jehu's bold challenge to the dynasty's adherents is cited at length; *cf.* the letter of the Rab-shakeh to Hezekiah (19^{10ff.}). There are presented in rapid, dramatic order the events of the sequel. **4. 5.** The consternation in the capital is depicted. The officials *sent to Jehu*, doubtless also by letter, their humble capitulation. For the official term, *he-over-the-house*, *cf.* I. 4⁶, and for *he-over-the-city* with its Akkadian parallel see Note. **6.** Jehu sends a second letter, ordering—if you are for me—the decapitation of the princes, whose heads are to be brought

in baskets to Jezreel by the officers. **7. 8.** The order is carried out; report is made to Jehu, who orders public exhibition of the remains *at the entrance of the gate*, the city's forum and market. **9. 10.** The climax comes on the morrow in Jehu's half-honest, half-impudent harangue: *You are innocent. It was I that conspired against my master and slew him. But who smote all these?*—with the inference in pious reservation, which might not be publicly denied, that this was by divine connivance. Cf. Grotius: "Tam mirabilis eventus ostendit hæc non humanitus sed divinitus disponi." V.^{10b} with its reference to Elijah is marked by Stade as secondary; but that there was a prophetic word concerning Ahab's house is not to be questioned. **11.** This slaughter in Samaria is followed by that of *all who were left of Ahab's family in Jezreel, and all his magnates* [^G kinsmen], *and his acquaintances, and his priests.* For this last term as of officers civil as well as religious see I. 4^{2ff.}

VV.¹²⁻¹⁴. The murder of the royal party from Judah. **12.** *And he arose* [^H + *and came*] *and went to Samaria. When he was at Beth-eked of the Shepherds in the way, (13) he* [^H Jehu] *met the brothers of Ahaziah, king of Judah.* The place-name means 'the Shepherds' Shearing-House.' The place has been identified, since Eusebius, with modern Bait Kād, about 3 miles E to N of Jenīn, see Guérin, *Samarie*, I, 333 (noting the several cisterns at the place, with which cf. *the cistern*, v.¹⁴), Abel, *GP* 2, 271; but Buhl (*GAP* 204), Šanda, *Alt (Pjb.)*, 27 [1931], 32 f.) doubt or change the identification. To Jehu's inquiry as to the party, they reply: *We are Ahaziah's brothers; and we have come down 'to inquire after' [Heb. for the peace of] the children of the king and of the queen-mother.* For the latter official title see above, I. 15¹³; because of Jezebel's predominance her own brood is courteously included. **14.** For the possibly round figure of *forty-two* murdered, cf. 2²⁴.

VV.^{15. 16}. Jehu's meeting with Jehonadab b. Rechab, and the latter's hearty co-operation. Here and in Jer. 35 we possess the unique references to the Rechabites, who planted neither garden nor vineyard, drank no wine, built no houses, but lived in tents; they were enthusiasts for the primitive religion of YHWH and the simple life of the desert. For their genealogy, connected with the Calebites and the nomadic

Kenites, see 1 Ch. 2⁵⁵, 4^{11.12} (read 'Caleb' for 'Celub,' 'Rechab' for 'Rechah'); cf. the Nazirites, and *n.b.* the puritanic likeness with the Nabatæans (Diodorus Siculus, xx, 94), and the cult of a Palmyrene deity, who "does not drink wine" (Cooke, *NSI* no. 140 B). See Meyer, *IN* 129 ff.; Lods, *Israël* (Index, *s.v.* 'Naziréens'); Oesterley and Robinson, *Hebrew Religion*, 184 ff.; Causse, *Du groupe ethnique*, 61 ff.; cf. Montgomery, 'Ascetic Strains in Early Judaism,' *JBL* 51 (1932), 183 ff. According to Jer. 35 Jehonadab was the prophet of the sect. **15.** Jehu *blessed him, i.e.,* saluted him; cf. 4²⁹. *Is thy heart right, as my heart is with thy heart?*: so EVV, but ignoring one difficulty in Heb.; with the original mng. of the Heb. adj. we may translate, *Is it straight with thy heart*, etc. With all the difficulty of a terse passage, the sense is plain: "Do we see straight together and alike?" The VSS attempted in various ways to simplify, followed by some modern critics; see Note. *And said Jehonadab, It is. If it be, give me thy hand.* So the EVV, following the Heb., except JV; the latter properly introduces in parenthesis the speaker of the second statement: *If it be (said Jehu)*. This is another case of lack of the *persona loquitur* in Hebrew dramatic story; cf. I. 20³⁴, and see Note for similar intrusion of the subject in some VSS. For the 'giving of the hand,' as act of fidelity cf. 1 Ch. 29²⁴, 2 Ch. 30⁸, Ezra 10¹⁰, Eze. 17¹⁸, and so the Muslim ritual in the election of a caliph; see at length J. Pedersen, *Der Eid bei den Semiten* (1914), 32 ff. **16.** *See my zeal for YHWH!* Cf. Elijah's outbursts, I. 19^{10.14}. *And they made him ride*: the pl. subject should probably be changed to the sing.; see Note.

V.17. Jehu, arriving at Samaria, exterminates the rest of Ahab's family.

VV.18-27. The slaughter of the *personnel* and followers of the Baal cult. No element in the whole history is more original than the wily stroke (*by subtlety*, v.19) of destruction of *all the prophets of Baal, all his worshippers, and all his priests*, through the ruse of Jehu himself celebrating a *great sacrifice* (v.19, in v.25 *holocaust*) to the Baal in his temple. With his patent enough zeal for YHWH Jehu must have played the artful diplomatist in the religious strife. The cautious Kittel registers the problem, but he and all critics

allow the story to be historical. The Baal devotees had once before experienced a similar drastic purging (I. 18), but had survived; they may have expected a complaisant policy in the matter of religion, now that Jehu had succeeded in his political aims. 19. The item of *the worshippers* (*servitors* might express the Hebrew noun), out of due order, has probably been introduced from the generalizing use of the term in vv.^{21. 23}. 20. *Sanctify a solemn-assembly for the Baal!* Cf. "Sanctify a fast!", Joel 1¹⁴; the noun, so translated in EVV, was used of the climax of religious rites; cf. Nowack, *Archäologie*, Index, s.v. עִזְרָה. 22. The word generally translated *vestry* is unique; see Note. For the clothing of the sacred staff at such rites cf. Lucian, *De Dea Syra*, 42, describing the ritual of the goddess: some 300 officiants of various degrees clad in white vestments and with caps, along with them a multitude of holy men, musicians, Galli, frenzied women. 25a. Jehu himself *finished offering the holocaust*; cf. Solomon's primacy at the dedication of the temple. 25b. Literally: *and the guards and the officers cast, and they went even to the citadel (or city) of the house of the Baal*. The first sentence is unintelligible with its verb without an object (which EVV supply, *cast them out*); for attempted corrections of seemingly obscure *citadel* see Note. For the guards see I. 14²⁷. 26. *And they brought out the pillar [the pillars] of the house of the Baal, and burned it*; 27a. *and they broke down the pillar of the Baal, and they broke down the house of the Baal*. The duplications are evident; in place of *the pillar* which they *burned* has been proposed *the Asherah*, which, as wooden, could be burned (cf. 23¹⁵), an ingenious but arbitrary suggestion. For Ahab's construction of this temple of the Baal with altar see I. 16³². 27b. The locality, later used as a latrine, was still known by repute in the writer's day. To cite Causse (p. 76), the event was altogether 'a revolution in grand style.'

VV.²⁸⁻³⁶. The sequel of Jehu's reign. VV.²⁸⁻³¹. The appraisalment of Jehu, which appears to go back to two hands, each with praise and blame:

28. *And Jehu exterminated the Baal out of Israel*; 29. *only* 30. *And YHWH said to Jehu: Because thou hast wrought well*

as for the sins of Jeroboam ben Nebat, which he entailed upon Israel, Jehu turned not away from them [with a secondary, rather ungrammatical plus the golden calves in Bethel and Dan].

in doing what is right in my eyes, and hast done unto the house of Ahab according to all that is in my heart, thy sons to the fourth generation shall sit upon the throne of Israel. **31.** And Jehu, not heeding to walk in the Law of YHWH, God of Israel, with all his heart, departed not from the sin [Heb. sins] of Jeroboam, which he entailed upon Israel.

Commentators vary in their critical judgment upon this material. Most regard it as a forthright composition; Stade considers vv.^{30, 31} as secondary to the editorial vv.²⁸⁻²⁹; Šanda finds v.²⁹ secondary. V.³⁰ professes to be an early, forsooth prophetic oracle to Jehu, commending him for his revolutionary reform and with promise of succession to the fourth degree (the longest dynasty of the North—the fulfilment being recorded in 15¹²). The prophetic sentiment of the time continued to support the dynasty; cf. 13^{4f. 14ff.}. Another kind of judgment from another kind of prophet is that of Hosea (1⁴): “I will visit the blood of Jezreel upon the house of Jehu, and bring to an end the kingdom of the house of Israel.”

32. In those days YHWH began to cut off [Heb. trim off] Israel; and Hazael smote them in all the border of Israel, **33.** from the Jordan to the rising of the sun, all the land of Gilead, the Gadite and the Reubenite and the Manassite, from Aroer, which is by the wady of Arnon, and Gilead and Bashan. Stade and others regard v.³³ as secondary and defiant of history on the ground that Transjordan was no longer Israelite territory. But it was Hazael who detached Transjordan, cf. ch. 13, and according to 14²⁵ it was this territory that Jeroboam II recovered. Note the incipient phrase here, YHWH began. The general statement in v.³³ may well be left as original, with the passage all the land of Gilead, the G. and the R. and the M., excepted as secondary; the remaining terms give the W-E and S-N directions. Cf. the enumeration of the divisions in Dt. 3^{8ff.}.

Now, with the inner turmoils of Israel and the aggressive expansion of Damascus, Transjordan was on the way of being lost for good. This reference to Hazael's conquest of Transjordan and the subsequent brief notices of Aramæan overlordship in the lands south of Damascus (12¹⁸¹, ch. 13), are placed in a larger setting by the Assyrian inscriptions. In 842/841 B.C., the year of Jehu's accession, Shalmaneser III attacked Aram, gaining victories on Hermon and in the Hauran, although unsuccessful in the siege of Damascus; he received the tribute of Jehu (Yaua) of Bit-Ḥumri (land of Omri), who thus sided against Aram, and of the Tyrians and Sidonians (according to his Annals inscription, col. iii), and his famous obelisk depicts Jehu himself presenting his tribute, the list of which, gold, silver, vessels of those precious metals, precious woods, is given in the accompanying text.² There came then a lull in the Assyrian advance until 805 B.C. in Adad-nirari's reign, thus giving scope to Aram for renewed aggressions upon her Israelite neighbours. **36.** The duration of the reign is given exceptionally at the end of the royal biography.

1. שַׁמְרוֹן : Grr., exc. Ⓞ^L, εϋ Σ., by early corruption of εἰς.—
 יוֹרְעָא : MS 174 שַׁמְרוֹן, Grr., Σαμαρείας κ. πρὸς, exc. Ⓞ^L της πολέως
 κ. πρὸς=Ⓞ ' (optimates) civitatis et ad (maiores natu) ' ; this
 latter correction of a primitive error in Ⓞ is to be accepted; read
 יוֹרְעָא וְאֶל־הַעִיר.—הַעִיר=Ⓞ^H; 1 MS וְהוּ=Gr. e; 5 MSS הוּ=Ⓞ^H;
 3 MSS וְהוּ=OGrr., Ⓞ; this last rdg. is expected.—[הַעִיר] אַחֲרָיִם :
 an evident gloss assigning the guardians to Ahab's family; it is
 helped out by Ⓞ^L al., as though rdg. אַחֲרָיִם בְּנֵי אַחָב, which correction
 GV EVV Klost., Burn., al. accept; St. elides five words here,
 cf. BH. For the legal terms, 'guardians' (Jos., παιδαγωγοί) cf.
 Est. 27.—לְאִמְרָא : apparently secondary, ignoring the epistolary
 form.—2. וְעִירָא : Ⓞ^L Ⓞ om. as unnecessary.—[מְבַרָא] : MSS
 257 260 וְעִירָא=VSS (Gr. v as sing.), Jos. ; the pl. is largely accepted,
 but the officers in question had charge of but one fortress.—הַנִּשְׁקָא :
 here 'armour'; see Note, I. 10²⁵.—4. מְבַרָא מְבַרָא : cf. Gen. 7¹⁹, etc. ;
 OGrr. simplify.—5. אִשְׁרָא עַל הַעִיר=Acc. *ša eli ali* (R. P. Dougherty,
Nabonidus and Belshazzar, 1929, 30); Grr. misunderstood אִשְׁרָא as

² See CP 303 f.; AB 459 f.; ATB 1, 343; and for the conqueror's inscriptions at large ARA 1, ch. 12. For the history of the period may be consulted Rogers, HBA 2, 222 ff.; Kraeling, Aram and Israel, ch. 9; Cook, CAH 3, 372 ff.; Kittel, GVI 2, 268 ff.; Lods, *Israël*, 445 ff.; Olmstead, HPS 397 ff.; Robinson, HI 1, 355 ff.; Meyer, GA 2, 2, 341 ff.

pl.—עשה : Grr., “we will do.”—6. ענית [ספדך] : 14 MSS עני=Grr., preferred by St., *al.*; but the fem. is adverbial; *cf.* GK §100, 3.—אנשי בני אהינכם : 17 MSS Ken., deR. om. אנשי : 6^L expresses the word with *ἕκαστος*=*ℒ* ‘unusquisque,’ followed by Benz., Kit.; 2 MSS om. בני with Hex.; 4 MSS omit ביה בני, which is to be accepted with St. (*q.v.* at length).—ובאו : Grr., *ενεγκατε*, as though Hif.=*℥* *ℑ*, accepted by Then., *al.*—V.^b. This somewhat superfluous and grammatically difficult statement is regarded by Wellh. (*Comp.*, 267) and St. as a gloss.—[גדלי] אה : *℥* *ℑ*=‘with,’ which gives the only possible construction; *ℑ* ignores; *ℑ*^H ‘these (magnates)’; there is no proof for early difference of text.—מגדלים for the subordinate participial construction see König, *Syntax*, §412, *g.* Joüon (*Mél.*, 5, 480) makes the ppl. passive, *rdg.* אהם. —7. וישתחו : 1 MS +ח-, and so Grr. (exc. A), Sym., *ℑ*^H *ℑ*, the emendation accepted by Burn., St.; but translation requires repetition of the object, not necessary in Heb. syntax; *cf.* foll. וישתחו where the Grr., exc. *ℑ*^L, add ‘them.’—וירעאה; B *al.*, *eis* *Ισραηλ*.—8. המלאך : *ℑ*^L om., putting the accompanying verbs in the pl., and so *ℒ*, but adding ‘messengers.’—צבויים; *cf.* Ugaritic *šbrt*, of a ‘band, company’; in LHeb. the word means ‘congregation.’—10. אפוא : MSS spell variously; *ℑ* *ℑ*^H *αφφω* (for this transliteration see 2¹⁴), *ℑ*^L om.—יהוה : 1^o : *ℑ*^H *⋆*.—2^o : 1 MS, *ℑ*^L om.—11. גדליו : Grr., *τ. αδρους αυτου*, exc. *ℑ*^L *τ. αρχιστευοντας αυτου* (=ℒ), representing גדליו (*cf.* I. 16¹⁴), accepted by Klost., St., *cf.* Burn., *BH*; but Kit. properly objects, noting the use of the word in v.⁶.—השאיך : Grr. here as pl.; *℥* here and at v.¹⁴ as Nif.—לו : B *αυτους*, error for *αυτου*.—12. ויבא וילך : 3 MSS, Hex., *ℑ* exchange the verbs, obtaining a common phrase; OGrr. om. the first verb; one or the other of these corrections is to be accepted; Klost., *al.* regard ויבא as error for ויהוא. ויהוא : acc. of direction; it is unnecessary to prefix ב, with St.—13. ויהוא : *ℑ*^L *℥* om. the noun; Dr. (*Tenses*, 210, n. 2) properly proposes והוא with parallel balancing clauses.—14. ויהפשיח חיים : 4 MSS Ken., deR., om., by early haplog.; *ℑ*^L *ℑ* om. חיים. וישתחו : 4 MSS Hex.; many Gr. MSS (*N al.*) *εσφαξεν* for *-av*; but change to sing. is not necessary, *vs.* Klost., St.—בור : אל בור : אל is demanded, and so Hebræus and Aq. understood, acc. to *ℑ*^H; 1 MS om. בור, and so the other Grr.—איש נהב : 11 MSS transpose the words, and so *ℑ*^L *℥*.—15. ויבצא : B† *κ. ελαβεν*, *al.*, *κ. ευρεν*.—יהונב : for the verbal element see Noth, *IP* 193, noting its occurrence in Akk., and in two Edomite names; נב is also Thamudene, *NPS* I, 136.—רכב : *cf.* S. Arab. names from the same root, *ib.*, pp. 200, 316.—היש את לבבך ישי : 7 MSS om. את, and so *℥* *℥*; 1 MS replaces with עם, in correspondence with the similar phrase below, and so St. would read; *ℑ* ‘in thy heart’; OGrr.=היש לבבך ישי, conformed to foll. sentence; another interpretation makes את=אתי (so in *℥*), noted in *ℑ*^H, and the original of a corruption in A (*μετα μου* to be read for *μ. σου*), and so Sanda decides.

Ken., deR.); the latter rdg. is supported by VSS (also \mathfrak{S}^H), and is required by the foll. pron. ; cf. מַצֵּה v. 27, where Grr. have pl. *N.b.* error of B, $\sigma\sigma\omicron\lambda\eta\eta$ for $\sigma\tau\eta\lambda\eta\eta$. Kit., Burn., St., *al.*, would read אֲשֵׁרָה . Ehrl. cancels the whole v. as merely a variant of v. 27.—**27.** $[\text{הַזֶּה}]$: if the passage be not duplicate of v. 26, St.'s correction to מִזֶּבֶחַ is plausible (so Šanda, *cf.* BH).— $\text{וַיִּתְּצוּ . . . הַזֶּבֶל}$: \mathfrak{S} om. on account of homoiotel. (\mathfrak{S}^H ✕).— לְמִזְבְּחֹתָי Kt., לְמִזְבְּחֹתָי Kt. (for avoidance of indelicacy, as with a related word, 6²⁵) ; Kt. is supported by VSS.— עַד הַיּוֹם : 4 MSS + הַיּוֹם = VSS ; Wellh. well remarks (*Comp.*, 289), that we have not here the later stereotyped phrase.—**29.** הַטָּאִי : *vs.* usual הַטָּאוֹת .— $[\text{אֵל}]$: many MSS בְּבֵית , but the locative is proper.—The clumsy addition, 'the calves of gold,' etc., appears secondary ; \mathfrak{S}^L \mathfrak{I} \mathfrak{T} attempt to improve the clause by inserting a verb.—**30.** רָבִיעִים : so at 15¹² ; otherwise רִבְעִים . *Cf.* the note of the inscriber of the second Nerab inscr. on seeing 'sons of the fourth generation' (*HNE* 445, *NSI* no. 65).—**31.** מַעַל הַטָּאוֹת : the sing. הַטָּאָה is again required ; for the prep. phrase, Or. MSS have מִמַּל ; see Note, I. 15³.—**32.** לְקַצֹּת : \mathfrak{T} לְמַתְקָה , 'to seize' ; \mathfrak{P} 'tædere' has induced Klost., Burn., *al.*, to emend to לְקַוֵּן , 'to abominate' ; but St. presents a similar Mishnaic construction of 'ק with ב, and the text is to be kept.—**33.** גֹּהֵל : 2 MSS pref. שָׂפָת , 'border' = Grr., \mathfrak{T} —a case of an early variant.—**34.** גְּבוּרָתוֹ : Grr. (exc. MS r) + $\text{καὶ τὰς συναψύσεις αὐτοῦ} = \mathfrak{S}^H$, taken from I. 16²⁰, *cf.* II. 15¹⁶.—**36.** *In Samaria* is out of position (*cf.* I. 22⁶², etc.), and is secondary (St.).—On account of the exceptional omission of synchronism with the South \mathfrak{S}^L (= \mathfrak{I}) fills out the lack with an historically false plus at end of the v. : "in the second year of Athaliah the Lord made Jehu son of Nimshi king," this followed by a long summary culled from 8²⁸–9²⁸ ; see Burn., St., Rahlfs, *SS* 3, 276 f.

Ch. 11. The bloody usurpation of the queen-mother Athaliah ; the concealing of the one surviving prince royal in the temple precincts ; the revolution handled by the priest Jehoiada with the aid of the guards and mercenary troops, resulting, despite the intrusion of the queen, in the coronation of the young Joash in the temple court with popular acclaim ; the effecting of a solemn covenant as between YHWH and the king and people, and also between king and people ; the murder of the queen, and the extermination of the Baal-cult in Jerusalem. || 2 Ch. 22¹⁰–23 ; *cf.* *Ant.*, ix, 7.

Apart from the question of sources we have here an historical story, which, of like style to the more dramatic one from the North, was the outcome of stirring political events. At this period coevally for both states in the middle of the ninth

century we observe religion playing its part as conviction of at least an intense minority, which was able to mass the populace to its colours for the actual crisis. Modern criticism may not distinguish too exactly between the religious and political elements of that age, far less than we may, for example, make exact diagnosis of the birth-throes of Protestantism. In both North and South Israel there occurred a popular uprising in the name of the national God—fanatical, as ever since in the history of monotheism. And these secular events are to be given their proper place in the process of Israel's religion leading up to the great Prophets and their more sublime cause. In the North the religious impulse was rather a flash in the pan, led by a bold soldier who knew how to use and arouse the people in the name of its God. In the South, on the other hand, there were sturdier elements. The Davidic dynasty of nigh two centuries' standing was threatened with extinction; we may only surmise the exasperation of the people under the ruthless hand of the alien Athaliah during her seven years of despotism. Nationalism—to use a modern word—required only leadership, and this was given it by what moderns call the Church, the religious establishment. It was 'the priest' Jehoiada who knew how to lay his conspiracy, manœuvre the military at hand, and organize the people. Jehoiada was the first political actor in the history of the kingdom since the day of Abiathar and Sadok, and a worthy predecessor of the age-long political pontiffs of the Jerusalem priesthood. The religious establishment succeeded permanently, while the prophets of the North, Elijah, Elisha, and the Sons of the Prophets, and Amos and Hosea, failed. The military is under the priest's control, 'by covenant and oath'; we may only speculate how this arm, including mercenaries, became interested in the cause. And associated with these forces for the first time the novel element of 'the people of the land' takes its part in a constitutional way, tempering for the remainder of the history of Judah the power of the monarchy. The Church and the People now make their appearance in the national records, and form together a novelty in ancient history.

The present record is historically sequel of, and literarily counterpart to, the brilliant story of Jehu's revolt. Yet the

two narratives are from different sources, Southern and Northern, excellent witness to a wide extension of such contemporary historical writing. Stade has advanced a criticism of the present story that would make vv.^{13-18a} an interpolation in the original document, on the ground that the death of the queen is reported twice (vv.^{16. 20}) and that in the interpolation the religious rather than the political motive is stressed. This criticism has been generally accepted, with much consequent dubiety as to the historicity of the interpolation. In contradiction to his Commentary, Kittel in his History ignores the whole episode of vv.^{13-18a}. But that can hardly be an invention, and we must assume contemporary writers, possibly spectators, whose accounts have been early amalgamated. The more official story ignored the scenes of violence narrated in the alleged interpolation, and yet the latter, reportorial-wise, tells true history; *n.b.* the reference to the otherwise unknown temple of the Baal and his priest Mattan. The main document is similar to the narrative of the later reformation under Josiah (cc. 22, 23), and appears to have come from an official scribe. On such Judæan sources Wellhausen remarks: "An ästhetischem und ideellem Werte stehn sie sehr weit hinter den samarischen zurück, aber historisch sind sie zuverlässiger." On the other hand the interpolation is in the vivid style of the Northern raconteurs. The queen it depicts is the natural counterpart of her mother Jezebel, and has inspired a similar dramatic story.¹

1. Athaliah's desperate action was motivated by Jehu's murder of her son, king Ahaziah. What ultimate counsel of despair she cherished, it is vain to speculate. 2. Only from Ch. do we learn that Jehosheba was wife of Jehoiada, and strangely enough the fact that the latter was the priest appears only below in v.⁹; here is an example of failures of connexion in ancient history. *She stole him away from the king's sons who were slain, him and his nurse, in the bed-quarters.* The stumbling parenthetical *him and his nurse* appears to be a gloss from Ch., where it has proper construction; *n.b.* the attempts of EVV at translation. 3. These sleeping-apart-

¹ For detailed criticism of the difficult text of the ch. see Wellh., in Bleek, *Einl.*⁴, 257 ff. = *Comp.*, 292 f.; Stade, *Akad. Reden*, 183 ff. = *ZAW* 5 (1885); Joüon, *Mé.*, 5, 480 ff.

ments were *in the house of YHWH*, in the large Oriental sense of 'house,' *i.e.*, in the priests' quarters. Here he remained *with her, i.e.*, the priest's wife. **4.** *Jehoiada*: most Gr. MSS add the expected title, *the priest* (and so Ch.) as in v.⁹; he is the first Jerusalemite priest to be named since the list of Solomon's officers in I. 4^{2ff.}. *The centurions* [Heb. *captains of the hundreds*] *of the Carians and of the guards*. *Carians* (RVV JV *Carites*) is the correct interpretation introduced by Ewald (*HI* 4, 135); the Gr. recognized it as *n. pr.* with *Xoppet*=*ῢ*^π; other VSS rendered with a military title (as AV 'the captains'), *ῤ* compounding it and the following noun in 'milites.' The word appears as Kt. in 2 Sam. 20²², but *Ῐ*r. as 'Cretans,' followed with 'Philistines.' For Cretans and Carians see Note, I. 1³⁸. The word may well be traditional like 'Schweizer' used of the European mercenaries. For the *guards*, *cf.* I. 14²⁷.

5. *And he commanded them, saying: This is the thing that ye shall do: the third of you who come on duty* [Heb. *come in*] *on the Sabbath, they shall keep guard of* [Heb. *who guard*] *the house of the king, 6. and the third at the gate Sur, and the third at the gate behind the Guards, [and ye shall keep guard of the house massāh—secondary, from v.⁷, plus an unintelligible word], 7. and the two detachments of you all who go off duty* [Heb. *go out*] *on the Sabbath, they shall keep guard of the house of YHWH* [*ῤ* plus *for the king*]; **8.** *and ye shall surround the king, all about, each with his weapons in his hand; and he who comes within the ranks shall be slain; and be ye with the king in his going out and his coming in.* The above passage is a *crux interpretum*, of great interest with its presentation of ancient military practice for which we can hardly expect accurate reminiscence of sharp military orders. The relay of the guards that came on duty on the morning of the day concerned was divided into three companies posted at three points, two gates being named; the other two relays (v.⁷), normally off duty, should report and guard the temple, and with change of person from the third to the second, should serve as bodyguard to the king. The Sabbath as a civic holiday was chosen for the occasion (*cf.* 4²³). Interpretations and criticisms of the text have been manifold. Wellhausen's suggestion to regard v.⁶ as an intrusion has been generally accepted; Skinner, in agreement, gives an excellent summary

of his results: "The guard was divided into three companies. On weekdays two of these were on duty in the palace and the third in the temple. On the sabbath the order was reversed, two companies being on guard in the temple and one in the palace. . . . he chooses the moment when on the sabbath the two companies have come up from the palace to relieve the third. . . . By detaining the third division he attains his end." But this presupposes military arrangements which are ingeniously invented by the critic; indeed the omission of v.⁶ with its exact local details is arbitrary. Šanda, who transposes vv.⁶⁻⁷, finds in the former a 'pre-redactional gloss' on the posting of the Sabbath guards. The above translation follows Joüon in general. The point of the passage is that all the troops are kept on duty, the several divisions with distinct orders. The gate Sur and that of the Guards (the latter also v.¹⁹) have not been identified. V.⁶ terminates with an obscure word, probably a scribal annotation; cf. EVV. For further details see Notes. **10.** *The spears* [pl. with Ch., AV RVV; \mathfrak{H} here *spear*=JV] *and the shields that were king David's, which were in the house of YHWH.* These were purely honorific armour; at I. 10²⁶ in addition to Solomon's golden shields which Shishak looted, \mathfrak{G} knows of 'the golden shields which David took from Hadadezer.' The v. is prob. secondary, dependent upon Ch., v.⁹, actual armour being the desideratum on such an occasion (Stade, Skinner, Eissfeldt). **11.** *And the guards stood, each with his weapons in his hand, at the right-hand corner of the house as far as the left-hand corner of the house—of the altar and the house—by the king round about.* The text is open to easy criticism, but correction is difficult. The king was not yet present, and Stade, Šanda, Kittel (*BH* 'fortasse') would omit the final phrase, and so Burney, who then reads 'round about the altar and the house.' Yet the reference to the king's presence may well be anticipative. The parenthesis *of the altar and the house*, if original, is an expansion of the scene; the house, in the Semitic sense of the word, would include the altar area in front, which was all guarded. **12.** *And he brought forth the king's son, and set upon him the diadem and the testimony.* *Diadem*, a rare word, has the etymological sense of consecration. The following noun as *testimony* is supported by all VSS, and so AV RVV;

it has largely been corrected by critics to *bracelets* on basis of its pairing with 'diadem' in 2 Sam. 1¹⁰, or, by etymological reference, to 'ornaments,' cf. JV 'insignia'; see Note at length. *And they made him king and anointed him.* Ch. introduces 'Jehoiada and his sons' as subject of the second verb. Šanda notes that also at the consecration of Aaron the crowning preceded the anointing (Ex. 29⁶⁻⁷, Lev. 8⁹⁻¹⁰). *Long live the king!*: so at Solomon's accession, I. 1³⁹. **13.** *Athaliah heard the noise of the guards, the people*: so \mathfrak{H} ; cf. EVV. But *the guards* is an intrusion, probably from Ch. The boldness of the desperate woman in coming to face the people in the temple is magnificent. The full arming of the patriots is evidence of the precarious conditions. **14.** *And she looked, and there was the king standing by the pillar according to the custom (i.e., the ritual)*: so correctly with GV FV EVV, but RVV^{mg} JV *on the platform*; for the variant translations see Note. For the pillar Jachin or Boaz comes to mind. Ezekiel's ritual for royal worship was that "the prince . . . shall stand by the post of the gate" (46²); and Jirku (AKAT) notes cases in Old-Bab. processes where legal action is taken 'by the pillar of Shamash' (citing CT ii, 47, 18; iv, 23, 21a; iv, 47, 11a). *With the captains and the trumpets by the king*: as we might say, 'with the officers and the military band.' By deflection of the sibilant in the word for 'captains,' *šârîm* > *šârîm*, 'singers' may be read; the Chronicler (v. 13) found a *double entente* in the word, and proceeds to expatiate on the theme of the singing; also the Grr. and \mathfrak{H} so understood the word, followed by some modern critics (e.g., BH)—an alluring correction! Cf. the music reported for Solomon's accession, I. 1⁴⁰, and see Gunkel, *Einl. in die Psalmen*, §5, 3, 17, etc. *All the people of the land*: for this constitutional phrase see below. *She cried out: Conspiracy! Conspiracy!*, EVV *Treason! Treason!* The woman had her last word like her mother Jezebel (9^{30ff.}). **15.** A higher military grade appears here in *the centurions, the officers of the army*; the former were chiefs of the guard, the latter the military superiors—not hitherto named; the asyndetic *centurions* is an intrusion to correlate the present orders with those earlier cited. Jehoiada's command for safeguarding the queen's person until she was officially executed outside of the sacred

precincts has caused much trouble, *e.g.*, in EVV : AV *have her forth without the ranks* (=FV) ; RVV JV *Have her forth between the ranks* (=GV) ; of these the latter interpretation is to be accepted, the former would require change of the Heb. prep ; some critics go to the extent of cancelling the prepositional phrase. 16. *They laid hands on her* : so AV (=GV) ; but RVV JV, *they made way for her* (=FV), the diverse interpretations following similar variety in VSS ; see Note ; the first one is here accepted. The troops hauled the queen out of the temple within the ranks to a palace gate and there killed her, at *the Horses' Entry in the king's house* (in v.²⁰, *in the king's house*). There was the Horses' Gate in the wall of Jerusalem (Neh. 3²⁸), a temple entry, where were later the horses given to the sun (23¹¹), but the present gate belonged to the palace ; see Smith, *Jerusalem*, I, 199, 325, and the discussion by Burrows in *AASOR* 14 (1934), 119 f.

17. *And Jehoiada made a covenant between YHWH and the king and the people, that they should be YHWH's people—and between the king and the people.* The term 'covenant-making' was also used in connexion with secret affairs, as in v.⁴ of Jehoiada's conspiracy. Here the first article of the covenant is primarily religious, for which *cf.* the covenant introducing Josiah's reform (23^{1ff.}) ; only here the priest is the officiant, there the king. This item, if historical, interestingly enough precedes the theme of the so-called Deuteronomic reform. The second article, between the king and the people, is political. Some critics would elide it, as absent in Ch. and most Gr. texts, and as a dittograph (see Note) ; but rather its omission as super-numerary, especially in the later democratic days of Jewry, is as much, if not more, probable. In this connexion is to be noted the political phrase *the people of the land*, recurrent in the ch., vv.^{14. 18. 19. 20}, and again subsequently, 15⁵, 16¹⁵, 21²⁴ (*bis*), 23^{30. 35}, 24¹⁴, 25^{3. 19}, in several of which cases the people act as with political right in emergencies. It also occurs in the Phœn. inscription of Yehau-milk (*ca.* 400 B.C.), the king praying for 'the favour of the people of this land.' In later Jewish language the element of this '*am hā-'āreš*' was most despicable (*cf.* the varying uses of the word 'people' in modern democratic societies), and the phrase here has been generally regarded as not meaning more than the populace. But it has

been increasingly recognized that the term has an original political import. For recent publications see M. Sulzberger, *Am Ha-aretz*, claiming that this element was member of a bicameral legislature; Eva Gillischewski, 'Der Ausdruck עַם הָאֶרֶץ im A.T.,' *ZAW* 40 (1922), 137 ff.; R. Gordis, 'Sectional Rivalry in the Kgdm. of Judah,' *JQR* 25 (1935), 242 ff. (holding that the term refers to the people of the countryside as distinct from the city); and especially the extensive treatise by E. Würthwein, *Der 'Amm ha'arez im A.T.*, with full bibliography. Gillischewski, Galling,¹ Würthwein reasonably agree that by this term, 'the people of the land,' 'die Gesamtheit der jüdischen Vollbürger' (Würthwein, p. 16) appears as 'a political factor,' unorganized, but acting in political crises. Note the use of the word 'land' in I. 4¹⁹, and cf. the similar democratic part of the people in Anglo-Saxon England. A remarkable Oriental parallel to the present 'covenant' appears in a South Arabian inscription, discovered by E. Glaser, and published by him in his *Altjemenische Nachrichten* (1906), 162 ff., and again with exhaustive editing by N. Rhodokanakis in *Sb.*, Vienna Academy, vol. 177, Abt. 1 (1915). This stone document of 23 long lines presents a constitution for the State of Kataban, the three parties being the God, the King, the Nation Kataban, with further specification of certain estates, military, economic, etc. Cf. the writer's article, 'Enactment of Fundamental Constitutional Law in Old South Arabia,' *Proc. Am. Philos. Soc.*, 67 (1928), 207 ff. In the present case the term appears in both of the components of the ch. as diagnosed by critics. On the royal covenant see M. Buber, *Königtum Gottes* (1936), ch. 7, 'Der Königsbund.'

18a. The destruction of the Baal temple, with its altars and images, the murder of the Baal's priest, all this by rapid mob action. The event introduces to us the first popular reform in Jerusalem. The priest's name *Mattan* is peculiarly Phœnician; see Harris, *Grammar*, 108; also see Note. **18b.** The temple is placed under special guard; there may well have been a contrary-minded minority to combat; cf. the comment in v.²⁰, *and the city was quiet*. **19.** For the *Guards' Gate* see v.⁶. The *finale* is that the young king formally took

¹ *Die Israelitische Staatsverfassung in ihrer Vorderorientalischen Umwelt*, AO 28, Heft 3/4 (1929), 32 f.

his seat on the throne of the kings, his ancestors. 20. For the repeated note of the slaying of Athaliah see above. The modern VSS, except JV, attach 12¹ here as v.²¹, with following variation in numbering of vv.

1. עתליה: so below, exc. vv.^{2, 20}. עתליהו = 8²⁶.—[ו'ראתה]: dittog.; om. with MSS, K_r.—מת בנה: Hex., 'her sons were dead.'—ותקם: Grr. om., exc. \mathfrak{L} = 'arose to action,' and not to be deleted, vs. St.—המלכה: cf. 'בית נמ', Am. 7¹³; in Phœn. the word means 'royalty > king'; there is no reason to change it to המלוכה with 6 MSS (= 25²⁶), vs. St.—2. יהושבע: Ch., יהושבעת, feminized form; cf. 'Ελισάβετ of N.T.—יואש: for the name see on 12¹.—אהויה: there is no reason, vs. St., Šanda (cf. BH), to substitute אהיה with Grr.—המנותרים: K_r. המנותרים, Pual, and so many MSS, Ch., and generally accepted, but the form may be Polal, קמנותים, with intensive sense of 'massacring'; cf. the Polel, 1 Sam. 14¹³—אתו: Ch. pref. ותתן, and so Šanda.—ויסתר אתו = \mathfrak{C} ; Ch., והסתירה = Grr., \mathfrak{S} \mathfrak{V} , which rdg. is now generally accepted; but \mathfrak{H} is the impersonal pl., as at v.¹⁹.—3. אמה: referring to the aunt; Ch. אַמָּה.—Grr., εὐ οὐκ ἔστω, avoiding notion of profanation of the temple; but the Three and \mathfrak{S}^H correct; cf. \mathfrak{C} בבית נקדשנו.—4. יהודיע: Grr., exc. B + ο ἱερεὺς = \mathfrak{S}^H .—[ה]קאיות: i.e., μέ'δ' > μέγδ'; for list of similar Kt.-K_r. variants see Gordis, *The Biblical Text*, 110 ff.—לכרי: for the collective generic cf. I. 1³⁸.—[ל]רצים: \mathfrak{G} transliterated, although using παρατρεχοντες at 10²⁵, I. 14²⁷; the translator recovered himself below, v.⁶, etc.; \mathfrak{L} inserted this translation before τ. Χορρεי.—" בית 2⁰: of the Grr. B v om.; \mathfrak{L} 'before the Lord'; Hex. (\mathfrak{S}^H ✕), 'in the covenant of the Lord'; translators objected to such a scene in the temple; there is no reason to cancel the phrase, vs. St., BH.—5. ושמרי: read with Joüon וְשָׁמְרוּ, as accepted above.—Ad fin. \mathfrak{G} \mathfrak{G}^H + 'in the gate.'—6. סור: Ch., היסוד, 'the foundation'; Grr., τ. ὁδω = \mathfrak{S}^H ; \mathfrak{C} 'of the men-of-war,' reduced by \mathfrak{A} to 'of war'; \mathfrak{S} וקרסא (?—see Brock., *Lex. syr.*, 698), which Barhebraeus interpreted with אנתיס 'hidden'; \mathfrak{V} as n. loci = modern VSS; Joüon sugg. צור, Galling (*Pjib.*, 27, 1931, 51 ff.) מוסים.—בשער 2⁰ = \mathfrak{L} \mathfrak{S}^H , other Gr. texts by error τ. πύλης.—קָקָה: Grr. om., exc. \mathfrak{L} Μεσσαε = Theodoret = \mathfrak{V} 'Messa,' and GV 'Massa'; the other VSS as though = מנסח = \mathfrak{N} + a noun from נסח, 'to tear away/down'; \mathfrak{S}^H 'from destruction'; MS z notes the tr. of the 'Others' with απο διαφθορας; \mathfrak{C} 'that it was not removed'; similarly Rashi ('from destruction'), Kimchi, and so AV, 'that it be not broken down'; then with further variation as 'ab irruptione' (so Tremellius and Junius—see Poole at length); RVV JV, 'and be a barrier' (cf. FV), and so Keil. Haupt suggests 'relieving one another' on basis of Arab. *nasaha*, 'to replace,' this ingenious suggestion may be supported by Jewish Aram. כַּקְחָא, כַּקְחָא, 'balance.'—7. ושמרו: to be preserved, vs. suggested change to וְשָׁמְרוּ.—אל המלך: redun-

dant repetition of על המזק, vv.^{8, 11}, and to be deleted, with Kamp., St., *al.*—8. השדרות: the military term=Akk. *sidirtu* (Delitzsch, *Ass. Hwb.*); Grr. transliterate, but Aq., Sym., τ. περιβολους, 'the precincts' (שׁוּמָהּ ?); פ' 'septum,' 'barrier,' which Joüon prefers.—וְהָיָה: =שׁוּמָהּ שׁוּמָהּ; שׁוּמָהּ κ. εγγεμετο; a group of MSS, κ. εσομαι.—9. הנהן יו⁰ שׁוּמָהּ ο συνητος=שׁוּמָהּ with plus, ιερευς.—השבת. . . את אנשיו באי השבת. . .—10. הנית: the pl. is required, and so Ch. (הניתים), VSS, EVV; read תניתה, for which pl. *cf.* Is. 2⁴, Mic. 4³.—שׁוּמָהּ adds to the v. repetition of the con-vocation in the temple.—12. הניור: שׁוּמָהּ שׁוּמָהּ το νεξερ (with subsequent corruptions, *e.g.*, B)=שׁוּמָהּ; שׁוּמָהּ το αγιασμα.—הקרות: Grr., το μαρτυριον=שׁוּמָהּ שׁוּמָהּ, and פ' 'testimonium'=modern VSS, exc. JV. Wellh.'s correction to הַעֲקִירִית after the parallel phrase, 2 Sam. 1¹⁰, and the noun in Is. 3²⁰='bracelets,' is now largely accepted (by Burn., St., *BH*, *al.*); Kimchi proposed the dress of royalty, as from root עיה II (*cf.* עני, 'ornament'), followed by Klost., and so JV 'insignia.' Derivation of the word from that root is preferable. The older interpretations have been various; Rashi, "he placed beside him the Torah, which is ערות, that he might read in it," with Dt. 17^{18a}. in mind; also the ordinance of the phylactery (Ex. 13⁹) has been suggested, and the oil of unction; see Poole. Sānda maintains the traditional interpretation, *cf.* the Roman rite of laying the Bible on the head of the episcopal ordinand; but this rite was suggested from the present passage, as so understood!—Most recently Robinson (*HI* 1, 351) would continue this interpretation as of 'a written document or charter,' and H. G. May (*JBL* 57 [1938], 81) has ingeniously compared a line in the Seven Tablets of Creation (iii, 105, Rogers, *CP* 22): "She (Tiamat) gave him (Kingu) the tablets of destiny, on his breast she placed them."—ויסלנו אתו וימשיקו: the sing. of the verbs is generally preferred by critics (and so 22 MSS Kt. in the first case) with the Grr.; but the verbs are collective, for there are many actors in such a ritual.—13. הרעין העם: the Aram. pl. form of the first noun indicates its secondary character; Ch., העם הרעים; Heb. MSS, VSS, modern trr. variously attempt improvement.—14. על עמוד: =23³, in similar circumstances; Ch. here עמודו, but in the later parallel, 34³¹, על עמודו (proof that Ch. has small authority in such variations); the VSS 'by the pillar,' exc. פ' 'super tribunal.' Gressmann (*ZAW* 1924, 321, n. 1) would read על עמודו in all places, *cf.* Egyptian exx.; but the Heb. phrase means merely 'in his place' (*e.g.*, Neh. 8⁷). Then., *al.* (*cf.* *BH*), and most recently C. R. North (*ZAW* 1932, 19 f.) would correct the present noun to הַעֲקִירִי, interpreting as 'on the platform'; but such changes only introduce an unknown object in contrast to the pillar; see Comm.—15. שרי המיאות: poss. secondary, from vv.^{4, 9, 10} (so St., Burn., *al.*).—פְּקָרִי: the form as at Num. 31¹⁴; the usual פְּקָרִי (*e.g.*, 25¹⁹) is demanded by St., Burn., *al.*—אל מבית אל ושורת; for the prepositional phrase='within,' *cf.* ל' למבית ל', Num.

18⁷, and so the Grr. in general; the text is to be kept. A few Gr. MSS have corrupted the prep. *εσωθεν* to *εξωθεν*, and this is the basis of S^{U} , 'outside of,' suggesting to some critics correction to S^{H} (e.g., *BH*). The Grr. transliterate the foll. noun, except Sym. with *εσω τ. διαταξων*. S^{L} has an exegetical plus, "and lead him in after the commanders" (for further plus of S^{L} in the v. see Rahlfs, *SS* 3, 289).— H^{H} : abs. inf., turned naturally into a finite verb by Ch., VSS.; *n.b.* S^{L} *θανατω θανατωθησεται*.—**16.** H^{H} *וַיַּשְׁמֹן לָהּ יַרְיֵם*: the tr., "and they made place for her" = T^{S} S^{H} Kimchi, was accepted by Renaissance scholars, and has been maintained since by moderns, Keil, Then., *al.*, most recently by Joüon (*Biblica*, 14 [1933], 458); but see Burn., denying that the alleged parallel H^{H} *וַיַּשְׁמֹן*, Josh. 8²⁰, means 'place, room.'— H^{H} S^{H} K^{H} *κ. εισηλθεν*, but by scribal error B -*θον*, A -*θαν*; S^{L} P^{L} make the verb causative with obj.—**17.** H^{H} *וּבִין הַמֶּלֶךְ וּבִין הַעָם*: not in Ch., represented in Grr. only by B A and a few cursives, asterisked by S^{H} ; St. holds that H^{H} is due to dittog., but the omission was due to simplification of an apparent repetition; Kit. in *BH* (not in *Comm.*) regards it as addition.—**18.** H^{H} *אֵת*: 18 MSS, Ch., H^{H} = Grr., T^{S} .— H^{H} *וַיִּשֶׁבֶת*: the name appears on a Lachish seal; *BASOR* 86 (1942), 24 f.— H^{H} *הַמְּוֹכַחֹת*: so pl. in Grr., exc. 2 cursives = S^{L} , and other VSS with sing.; the sing. is demanded by some critics, e.g., St., but the generalizing pl. is not out of place.—**19.** H^{H} *הַמְּאֹת*: as over against *הַמְּאִיֹת* above, vv.^{4f.}.— H^{H} *וַיִּרְדּוּ*: impersonal pl., cf. vv.^{2. 12}; some Gr. MSS change to sing.— H^{H} *וַיִּשֶׁבֶת*: Ch., "and they seated the king"; Grr., exc. A, "and they seated him"; H^{H} is far preferable *in re* the formal accession, cf. I. 2¹².—**20.** H^{H} *בֵּית מֶלֶךְ*: K^{H} *בֵּית הַמֶּלֶךְ*, and so many MSS *Kt.*; but for the antique, non-articulated phrase see I. 15¹⁸.

Ch. 12 (EVV, exc. JV, 11²¹–12²¹). The reign of Jehoash of Judah. || 2 Ch. 24; cf. *Ant.*, ix, 8, 2–4. *N.b.* the quite contradictory midrash in Ch. for the story of the temple repairs, along with a good historical tradition of a breach between the king and the priesthood in the latter part of the reign; Josephus follows Ch. The history is a literary continuation of ch. 11. As there, the historian is not a temple annalist; he is distinctly secular with his record of the royal rebuke of the priests for their dishonest handling of the temple funds and his novel detail of how their peculations were stopped. Also he ignores the Chronicler's doubtless true tradition of the scandalous murder of Zechariah ben Jehoiada by the Jerusalem mob.

VV.¹⁻⁴. The introductory data of the reign. The unusual placing of the king's age at accession in v.¹, as of seven years,

is a link with 11⁴. The round figure of forty years for the reign (so for David and Solomon) arouses suspicion. As has not been generally observed, according to dynastic rule Jehoash's reign should be dated from his infancy when he became heir, and the six/seven years of Athaliah should not be reckoned in the royal chronology; the subtraction of this figure would help in reducing the disparity between the Judæan and Israelite chronologies from Jehu to 721 B.C.—165 years for the former, 143 for the latter. Meyer in his chronology, *GA* 2, 2, 438, exceptionally assigns 39 years for Athaliah and Jehoash together. The priest Jehoiada acted as vizier of the realm and as tutor of the boy king: the latter *did the right in YHWH's eyes, all his days that Jehoiada the priest instructed him*—so the Heb. literally, but with question as to the relative pronoun. EVV, following Grr., *ŷ*, tr. the relative with *wherein, i.e.*, restricting the king's right conduct to the time of his tutelage; but Ki. absolutely ignores the later infidelity charged against him by Ch.; the word might be rendered with *as*; but rather, the relative clause may be wholly a gloss to conform with Ch.; see Burney's lengthy discussion. The verbal root of *instructed* is that of *tôrāh*; cf. Samuel's announcement to the people, "I will instruct you in the good and right way" (1 Sam. 12²³); the present is the earliest case of the use of the verb in individual instruction by a teacher, else only appearing late, *e.g.*, Prov. 4¹¹. Also according to Ch. the good priest found Jehoash's two wives for him.

VV.⁵⁻¹⁷. The rehabilitation of the temple and its funds. Cf. the restoration in Josiah's reign, ch. 22, the text of which has been affected by the present narrative. There are to be recalled the many Bab. and Ass. inscriptions celebrating the restoration of ancient fanes. Ch. attributes the present condition of the temple to 'the sons of Athaliah, that wicked woman'; but the sumptuous days of Solomon were long past, and the building must have fallen into sad decay. VV.⁵⁻⁹ By the royal command all direct religious taxes and voluntary offerings in cash (*silver*) were to be segregated and used solely for the repairs. When this order was decreed is not stated; but *in the twenty-third year of king Jehoash the priests had not repaired the breakdown of the house*; the clerical caste was sadly in fault (v.⁷). Thereupon the king summons

Jehoiada and the priests and upbraids them, and these agree on the one hand not to bank those moneys for themselves, and on the other hand to be relieved from the expense of repairs that would normally fall upon the temple exchequer. With the difficulty of making *haj* to the central sanctuary, offerings in kind were generally turned into *current money* (so \mathfrak{H} in v.⁵), which was easily appropriated by mercenary priests. VV.¹⁰⁻¹³. The high-minded Jehoiada may not have been able to control his college of priests. It was in pursuance of his suggestion that the first collection box in history was invented and placed at the entry of the temple; into this box *the priest-guardians of the threshold* (appearing again at 23^d) at once deposited the moneys under the eyes of the givers. This particular fund appears in Josiah's reign (22^d) with repetition of the present language. The *chest* as a depository appears in the N.T. as the *korban* (Mt. 27⁶, cf. Jos., BJ ii, 9, 4). When the box was full, a commission, consisting of *the royal scribe* (cf. I. 4³) and *the high priest*, minted and banked the moneys, which were paid out to *the overseers*, and these paid the workmen. VV.¹⁴⁻¹⁵. A further condition was made, which might well be a citation from a written agreement, that none of the money should be spent (Heb. impf.) on ritual vessels, etc. The administration was bent on economy. V.¹⁶. The 'faithfulness' of the parties to the contract is commented upon—a novelty in both church and state. V.¹⁷. A final clause in the agreement ordered that the technical items of *guilt- and trespass-money were not to be brought* [so the impf. verb again] *into the house of YHWH, they were to be the priests*—i.e., remain the perquisite of the sacred *personnel*.

5. 6. The order of the king to the priests: *All the money of devotions that is brought into the house of YHWH—the 'rate-money'* [=OGGr.; \mathfrak{H} *current money*], *each* [\mathfrak{H} + *money per person*] *at his rating, 'and'* [not in \mathfrak{H}] *all the money which it occurs to one's mind to bring into the house of YHWH—6. the priests shall take to themselves . . . and repair, etc.* With the correction, *rate-money*, and the elimination of a following phrase (changes now generally accepted), the moneys fall into two great classes, of taxes and voluntary offerings. For the former cf. the tithes, and the poll-tax (Ex. 30^{11ff.}); for the free-will offerings (*nēḏābāh*), apart from the Torah, see

Ezra 1⁴, etc. For the expression of voluntary concern, literally 'to come up upon the heart,' cf. Jer. 7³¹. 6. (resumed)—*the priests shall take to themselves, each from his acquaintance*: so most modern VSS after T; below, v. 8, this arrangement is prohibited by fresh orders. But such personal handling between priest and client appears absurd, as though the former were a small parish priest; Šanda thinks of priests assigned to the several districts of the land and so acquainted with the devout. But the noun translated in EVV (exc. JV) with 'acquaintance' also appears in Ugaritic, where the pl. is aligned with 'priests' and 'holy ones.' While the word etymologically signifies 'merchant,' it may indicate in this connexion a class of temple-tellers; cf. the 'money-changers' in the Jerusalem temple, Mt. 21¹², etc.; see Note. 10. *And the priest Jehoiada took a chest, and bored a hole in its lid, and set it beside the 'pillar' [H altar] on the right hand as one comes into the house of YHWH; and the guardian priests of the threshold would put therein all the money.* Stade's correction, based on Gr. transliterations, reading by a slight change *mšbh* for *mzbh*, has been generally accepted, i.e., *the pillar*; this word is generally used of a heathenish object (e.g., 18⁴, 23¹⁴), and yet the seer in Is. 10¹⁹ foresees 'a pillar' and 'an altar' to be reared at the border of Egypt. A possible confusion of the two words occurred above, 10²⁷. The Grr. glossed over the distasteful word with a transliteration, H altered it. For the exalted position of *the guardians of the threshold* cf. 23⁴, 25¹⁸, and see Frazer, *Golden Bough*, 3, 1 ff., for such functionaries. 11. *And it was, when they saw that there was a large quantity of silver in the chest, that the royal scribe and the high priest came up and minted (i.e., in ingots) and reckoned the silver found in the house of YHWH.* The title 'high priest' (literally 'great priest') is late, introduced again in 22⁴⁻⁸, 23⁴, probably of post-Exilic origin (cf. Hag. 1¹, Zech. 3¹), and should be simplified to 'the priest,' as elsewhere in this narrative; cf. Morgenstern, 'A Chapter in the History of the High-Priesthood,' *AJSL* 55 (1938), 1 ff. Another, probably old, title of the primate appears in *kôhên hâ-rôš* (25¹⁸). A far more ancient title appears in Ugaritic *rb khnm* (Gordon, *Ugar. Handbook*, 2, 62: 54 f.), continued in the Phœnician (Harris, *Gram.*, 110). Stade would eliminate the whole reference to that functionary, but

n.b. the following pls., while there is no intrinsic objection to this statement of dual accounting. The verb translated above with *minted* appears, following tradition, in the EVV as *put up in bags* (and similarly GV FV); see Note. But Eissfeldt (*FuF* 1937, 163, reprinted in his *Ras Schamra u. Sanchuniathon*, 42 ff.), pursuing the ingenious argument made by Torrey in 'The Foundry of the Second Temple at Jerusalem' (*JBL* 55 [1936], 247 ff.), interpreting the *yôšêr* of Jer. 18¹¹, Zech. 11¹³, as of the official mint-master who smelted the bullion into ingots, finds the same mng. here with root *šûr* || to *yšr*. There was no coinage; silver was cast into ingots of round bars or rings; see Benzinger, *Arch.*, §42, with the Egyptian representations of the latter form of moulding, also Nowack, *Arch.*, §37, and Torrey cites Herodotus, iii, 96, for Darius I's rendering of loose silver into bullion preserved in jars. The following verb, *and they counted*, refers then to these ingots. **13.** *The masons* [Heb. *wall-makers*] *and the stone-hewers*: for the first noun, by change of root *gdr* to *gZR*, Ehrlich sensibly proposes *the carpenters*, so obtaining balance with 'the wood-artisans and the builders' in v.¹², and 'the timbers' and 'the stone' just below. **14.** *Only there were not to be made* [H] *in the house of YHWH*; most Grr., 'for the house of the Lord' = EVV; H 'templi Domini'] *cups of silver, snuffers, basins, trumpets, any vessels of gold and vessels of silver, of the money that was brought into the house of YHWH*. The bracketed Heb. appears senseless, the Grr. give sense but repeat the phrase occurring at end of the v. The bracket looks like an intentional gloss—the vessels were not to be made in the temple, thus relieving the stringency of the order against misapplication of the funds. For the list of vessels cited *cf.* I. 7⁵⁰, here an evident accretion.

VV.^{18. 19.} The invasion by Hazael of Aram, and his capture of Gath; he is bought off from attacking Jerusalem with treasures of the temple. This brief datum, continuing the history in 10^{32ff.}, presents an otherwise unknown advance of the Aramæan power to the SW, doubtless seeking control of the trade-route by the sea; *cf.* Meyer, *GA* 2, 2, 341 ff. Gath had remained a Philistine enclave within Judah (see I. 2³⁹), as the reference to it as a foreign city in Amos 6² proves, and according to 2 Ch. 26⁶ Uzziah later broke down its wall; such autonomous city-states were a part of the

ancient political order. That there was from this epoch a temporary suppression of the city appears from its absence in the list of Philistine cities in Amos 1^{6ff.}, but it is mentioned by Sargon (*ARA* 2, §§30, 62). Its identification has long been disputed; see Smith, *HGP* 196 ff.; Döllner, *GES* 28 ff.; Abel (*GP* 2, 325), following Guthe, Albright (*AASOR* 2-3 [1923], 11 f.) identifies it with Tell-el-Mensiyeh, 10 km. from Beit Jibrin on the road to Gaza. V.¹⁹ notes the fact that the temple had been cherished by the king's forbears, not only by the pious Jehoshaphat but also by the 'evil' Jehoram and Ahaziah (cf. 8^{18. 27}). With this sacred loot the invader was satisfied, even as had been the Egyptian Shishak generations earlier (I. 14^{25ff.}).

VV.²⁰⁻²². The plot of certain named courtiers and their assassination of the king. The Chronicler doubtless possesses a true, if frail tradition of the king's latter days: how that after the death of the excellent Jehoiada his son and evident successor Zechariah denounced the sins of the people, for which *lèse majesté* he was stoned to death in the temple court (of which crime a reminiscence is preserved in Mt. 23³⁵); for this godless outrage the kingdom fell prey to the Aramaean invader, the king himself suffered 'great diseases,' and finally met his death by the conspiracy here narrated. It is useless to guess at the *motif* of the conspiracy, whether personal, political, or religious. The royal successor Amaziah suffered the like fate (14¹⁹); like the North, the South was in the nadir of disorder. For such exact records of assassination of a king cf. that of Sennacherib, 19³⁷. 21. The place of assassination is *Beth-millo*, but the concluding local note (RVV JV *on the way that goeth down to Silla*) is absolutely obscure; see Note. Begrich (*Chronologie*, 196) correctly finds parallel sources in vv.^{21. 22a}, the second with more detail.

1. יהואש : יואש² : יואש¹ 2, and so *inf.*, vv.^{20. 21}, also I. 22²⁶; the same variation in name of the contemporary Northern king, 13^{9. 10}. For the name cf. יואש in a Lachish tablet (Torczyner, *LL* no. 2) and in Elephantine papp.; the verbal element appears as 'ws in Aramaic names (Lidzb., *HNE* 210); this corresponds to Arab. 'ws, 'to give,' which element is frequent in OArab. names; see *NPS* 1, 218, and cf. Albr., *BASOR* 79 (1940), 28, n. 1; see further Note below on 16¹. Of same origin is יואשיהו, 22¹.—2. צביה : 'gazelle' (Noth) = צביא in Eleph. papp.—3. [כל] ימיו אשר : Ehrl.

would read **ימי אשר**, as the Grr. understood (*cf.* GK §130, c), **Šanda** **הימים אשר**.—4. **כרו**: so 14⁴, 15⁴, 35; see Note, I. 15¹⁴.—5 *ff.* See St., *ZAW* 5 (1885), 208 ff. (= *Akad. Red'n*, 192 ff.), *SBOT*, and the current commentaries.—5. **בנה** [נה] = Hex., **ⲛ ⲡ** (Ⲥ paraphrases), but **Ⲥ Ⲥ^L** = **נה**, as below, and accepted in Comm.—**בנה נפשות**: this superfluous legal expression is reminiscent of Lev. 27², which ch. gives the money-rating for vows of kind.—**כל** [נה]: read **וכל**, lost by haplog.—6. **איש מאת מכרו**: the pl., **מכרם**, appears in an Ugaritic list of temple castes, after *khnm* and *hšm*; see Virolleaud, *Syria*, 1937: 163 ff., Gordon, *Ugar. Handbook*, 2, 62: 54 f. The root is **מכר**, and the word means primarily, 'trader, bargainer,' proceeding to Arab. *makkār*, 'cheater.' The dubious form **ממכרו** appears at Dt. 18⁸, for which see Dr., *ad loc.* LHeb. **קקר** = 'acquaintance,' and so **ⲛ** here, followed by Rashi, Kimchi, and modern VSS (exc. JV with a novel translation, 'from him that bestoweth it upon him'); Grr., *ανηρ απο τ. πρασεως αυτου*, and so supporting the above interpretation; **ⲡ** 'iuxta ordinem suum.'—**ברק**: for the root and derivatives see Lexx.; it proceeds from the notion of a 'rift, break,' so Akk., to that of 'repair,' so Syr. The Grr. transliterate (exc. Sym. with *ἐπισκευή*, and again below with *τὰ δέοντα*); **ⲡ** 'sartatecta,' and below 'instauratio'; **Ⲥ^H** cleverly rendered the Gr. transliteration into the corresponding Syr. noun.—9. **קתח**: **קתח** is expected; for similar exceptions see GK §93, h.—**לבלתי**: **Ⲥ^L** om., apparently by intention in the dubious context.—**ברק**: **Ⲫ** *βδελυγμα* (!).—10. **ארו**: see Haupt for this as correct abs. form.—**הר בילתו**: the Grr., e.g., B A, are much confused.—**אצל המונה בימין**: = **Ⲥ^L**, Jos.; other Grr. transliterate: B *παρα ιαμειβειν*, A *π. αμμασθη*, N *αμμαζειβη* = **Ⲥ^H**; see Comm. for correction to **הפצה**; Kamph.'s correction to **תמונה**, accepted by Benz., is not supported by the Grr.—**בימין** Kt. = **Ⲥ^L**. = Aq. (see Rahlfs, SS 3, 245).—**בבא איש בית י** = **Ⲥ^L**; **Ⲥ Ⲥ^H** *εν τω οικω ανδρος ακω/οικου Κυριου* (with what sense?). **Ⲥ Ⲥ^H** avoid foll. **שנה**, and tr. **המונה** as though **הנמצא** = **Ⲥ^H**; *cf.* v.¹¹.—**ותנו**: for this reversion of aspects (*cf.* v.¹²) see Dr., *Tenses*, §114.—11. **הקרו**: Ch., **ויערו**, 'and they emptied,' and so **ⲡ** 'effundebantque'; Grr. (**Ⲥ^L** om.), **Ⲥ^H ⲛ** 'bound up,' and so **Ⲥ** **Ⲁ**, but transposing it and the foll. verb to obtain proper sequence; St. follows suit, correcting to **הצרו**, from root **צר**; *cf.* modern VSS. But see Eissfeldt's correction, accepted above; the same verb, **צור**, with similar mng., appears at I. 7¹⁵. The verb **נתר**, 22⁴ (with correction of **Ⲫ**), is parallel in mng.—12. **יר** [על] Kt., **ירי** KṚ.; the former is correct, *cf.* 22⁵, where present KṚ. is absent, and **ירם** below, v.¹⁶.—**הפקרים**: Kt., **הפקרים** KṚ., conforming with 22⁵: read **הפקרים**; *cf.* the variant form in 11¹⁵.—13. **לגורים**: read **לגורים**; see Comm.—**ולכל ולקנות**: Grr. om. the conj. —**לחוקה**; for inf. constr. in **ה** see GK §45, d; **Ⲥ^L** + *αυτον* = **Ⲥ^H**, suggesting to Klost., *al.* (not Šanda), the reading **לחוקה**; but the **Ḳal** may be used in the absolute sense (a case in Josh. 2⁶).

Ch. introduces the implied object, 'the house' = בית here.—14. [יהוה] בית : Grr., 'for the house,' exc. n, 'in the house' = בית בית בית .—16. לרת לעשי הזלחה : but this category means the superior technical officers at v.¹⁵, yet here the paid labourers—a careless expression, or to be elided with Benz., St.—17. הזמאות : = בית בית ; 17 MSS הזמאות, and so as sing. = Grr., בית בית , which is to be accepted. — יהו : 3 MSS יהו = VSS.—18. או : archival, not 'Flickwerk' (so Šanda).—21. ויקשו קשר : בית בית κ. εδησαν παντα (error for επ αυτον) συνδεσμον ; בית κ. συνησαν επ αυτον κ. εδ. συνδ. — בית מלא היורד פלא : the Grr. variously transliterate the *nn. pr.* ; בית avoided היורד, and Rahlfs finds the original text in εν οικω Μααλω τω εν Γααλα. For rendering of the ppl. two makeshifts have been attempted : (1) making it geographical along with בית מלא, so בית = AV 'which goeth down to S.,' expanded in RVV JV (see Comm.) ; בית εν τη καταβασει Αλλων = בית 'in descensu Sella' ; or (2) construing it with Joash, 'when he went down,' so Aq., Sym., Hex., בית בית (Α καταμενοντα is to be corrected to καταβαινοντα). Rewritings have been proposed, e.g., by Then., Cheyne, Winckler, Haupt, Šanda. Smith, *Jerusalem*, 2, 112, proposes on chance a location near the Millo in Jerusalem.—22. יתור so MS L in BH, and many older prints, following over 50 MSS (see deR.—there is a misprint in Ginsb.¹), and so בית ; the generally received and preferable text (in view of the duplication of the odd name) is יתור, supported by the other VSS ; but the other is an ancient rdg., as the parallel, יתר, in Ch. shows.—שערת : *n. pr. m.* : cf. גבתה, I. 11²⁰, q.v. Ch. understood the name as fem., making the mother an 'Ammonitess,' and following this up with turning 'Shomer' into 'Shimrith,' 'a Moabitess' ; such a development based on the grammatical gender is not to be accepted, vs. GB, Noth.

13¹⁻⁹. The reign of Jehohaz of Israel. Cf. *Ant.*, ix, 8, 5. For criticism of the ch. see Stade, *ZAW* 5 (1885), 295 ff. = *Akad. Reden*, 197 (characterizing the ch. as 'ein wahres Gewirr'). Apart from the usual regnal data and religious criticism this section consists of brief notes on the conflicts with Aram, on which see further below, vv.^{22ff.} The inverted order of vv.⁴⁻⁶, recounting the king's appeal to יהוה , who then gave Israel a deliverer, and they went out from under the hand of Aram, and v.⁷, detailing authentically the well-nigh complete destruction of Israel's military forces, stamps the former section as an awkward intrusion (*n.b.* the bracketing of vv.⁵⁻⁶ in EVV), as has been generally recognized. The indefinite reference to a deliverer is reflection from 14²⁷ ; most unlikely have been the attempts at identification, as Winckler's suggestion that it refers to the Assyrian Adad-nirari, or Cook's

alternative suggestion of Zakar of Hamath (*CAH* 3, 376). The introductory words of v.⁷, *For he did not leave* [not as with JV, *for there was not left*] *to Jehoahaz of the people save fifty steeds and ten chariots and ten thousand foot*, etc., connect with v.³, *the anger* [root 'np] *of YHWH was kindled against Israel*; cf. the reason given by Mesha for Moab's earlier humiliation, "for Chemosh was angry [the same root] against his land." **6.** *And moreover the Asherah remained in Samaria*: the survival of this heathenish symbol, apparently untouched by Jehu (10^{26, 27}), motivated the ensuing calamity. **7.** The figures for the remnant of the army are to be compared with the Assyrian report of Ahab's 2000 chariots and 10,000 foot at the battle of Karkar; the correspondence for the last figure is of interest, even if it seems absurdly high. For the question of 'steeds,' vs. 'horsemen,' as the word is generally understood, see the discussion in Note, I. 1⁵. Löhr, cited there, holds that here distinctly cavalry is meant; yet the word is aligned with chariots. **8.** The *might* ascribed to Jehoahaz is indeed formulistic.

VV.¹⁰⁻²⁵. The reign of Jehoash of Israel and his success over Aram, with legends of Elisha. Cf. *Ant.*, ix, 8, 6, 7. VV.¹⁰⁻¹³. The regnal data. **10.** *In the thirty-seventh year of Joash king of Judah began Jehoash ben Jehoahaz to reign*: the 39th or 40th year is expected (cf. v.¹); the Grr. have attempted various corrections. **12. 13.** These final data are out of place here, and are duplicate of 14^{15, 16}; the unusual language for the succession, *and Jeroboam sat upon his throne*, proves the secondary character. An early editor may have desired to place the original section, bracketed in Amaziah's reign, in a more appropriate setting. Ⓞ shows that the passage is primitive. Ⓞ¹ made correction by transferring it to end of the ch., and then omitting the duplicate 14¹⁵, but inconsistently retaining v.¹⁶. Šanda holds that this position of the passage is original; but Lucian is a weak authority, even with his faculty of putting things in their right place. See also Skinner for attempt at restoration of original order.

VV.¹⁴⁻¹⁹. Elisha's magical omens of victory for Jehoash. The prophet had appeared in the story of Hazael's accession to the throne of Aram, ca. 840 B.C. (ch. 8); he reappears now after 40 years (Jehoash ca. 800); Šanda calculates his

age at 85–90 years. An affectionate relationship is postulated between prophet and royalty, as *vs.* the editorial condemnation of the dynasty. The king is said to have applied to him the proud title ‘my father, my father,’ that the latter had given to his master Elijah (2¹²). VV.^{15ff.} For cases of creative, sympathetic magic similar to the shooting with arrows here recorded *cf.* Ex. 17^{8ff.} (the propping up of Moses’ hand with the rod of God in the battle with Amalek), Jos. 8^{18ff.} (Joshua’s stretching out the javelin towards Ai until its capture), Jer. 18 (the prophet’s breaking of the earthen jar as doom on Jerusalem); see Frazer, *The Golden Bough*, Suppl. Vol., cc. 1, 2; A. Lods, ‘Le rôle des idées magiques dans la mentalité israélite,’ in *O.T. Essays*, ed. D. C. Simpson; Dhorme, *L’Évolution religieuse d’Israël*, 288 ff. There are two acts in the magical drama. VV.¹⁵⁻¹⁷. With his hand on the king’s hand, at *the window eastward*, *i.e.*, towards Aram, the prophet bids the king, *Shoot!*, accompanying the action with a word of power, *An arrow of victory of YHWH’s, and an arrow of victory at Aram!* For such a ‘holy word’ *cf.* Num. 21¹⁷. The following specification of the coming victory at *Aphek* is most improbable even in a mere story; the item is an insertion, either based on some tradition of the scene of the victories (not known in v.²⁵), or rather a reminiscence of I. 20^{28ff.}, where the unnamed ‘man of God’ and ‘king of Israel’ appear, with subsequent triumph at Aphek. VV.^{18. 19}. An omen for precision of the number of victories. The art depended upon the will and energy of the operator; the king’s three strokes proved him remiss in forcefulness, for which the prophet chides him on the loss of his great opportunity.

VV.^{20. 21}. The death and burial of Elisha, and the miracle effected by his dead body. Mention of *the Moabites* as annual invaders of Elisha’s home-country (Abel-meholah in Issachar, I. 19¹⁶) appears to be an absurdity. For such forays of Moabites and Ammonites *cf.* Am. 1¹³, 2¹. In v.²¹ AV has a circumlocution to ease the Heb.: “when the man was let down and touched the bones of Elisha,” with like circumlocution RVV JV, ‘as soon as the man touched the bones,’ whereas \mathfrak{H} reads, *and the man went and touched the bones*—an impossible use of the first verb with a corpse as subject.

By slight correction of \mathfrak{H} (made by some VSS) read: *And they went off. And the man came in contact with Elisha's bones, and he revived.* Even as Elijah had miraculously ascended into heaven, so legend gave his disciple's dead body miraculous power.

VV.²²⁻²⁵. The victories over Aram. **22.** The Heb. verb requires the pluperfect, *Hazael . . . had oppressed Israel*; the v. is editorially resumptive. Cf. the Mesha inscr., l. 5, "Omri king of Israel afflicted Moab many days.". **23.** A parallel to vv.^{4ff.}, and of similar origin; \mathfrak{G}^L transfers it after v.7. The final *until now* fails in Grr., and is a pious addition. **24. 25.** For the contemporary Aramæan history see the literature cited in n. 1 to Comm., I. 20. Ben-Hadad II, to whom proleptic reference was made in v.³, succeeded his father, and fresh authentic light has been thrown upon his reign by the Aramaic, but Hebraizing, inscription of Zakar, 'king of Hamath and La'ash' (=Akk. Nuḥašše), found at Afis (named in the inscription), 40 km. SW of Aleppo (Bibliography, xli). Zakar records how he successfully withstood a siege of his fortress Hazrak (the Hadrak of Zech. 9¹) 'by Bar-Hadad bar Hazael king of Aram' and his seventeen allies, kings with their armies, including far northerly \mathfrak{K} ue-Cilicia (see on I. 10²⁸), 'Amḳ (the 'vale' of Antioch), Gurgum, Melitene, Sam'al. There is religious parallel with the section above, vv.^{14ff.}; Zakar took recourse to 'seers and soothsayers,' who promised him deliverance in the name of Baal-of-the-Heavens. The chronology is sketched out at large from the Ass. records. In 805 B.C. Adad-nirari III subjected Hatti-land, Amurru, Tyre, Sidon, Omri-land (*i.e.*, Israel), Edom, Philistia (*cf.* Hazael's capture of Gath, 12¹⁸), and marched upon Damascus, where he "shut up Mari, the king of Damascus, in Damascus his royal city"; there follows the accounting of the rich loot taken in lieu of surrender (*KB* 1, 190 ff. = *CIOT* 202 ff.; *CP* 305 f.; *ARA* 1, §739, *cf.* §§735, 740; *AB* 462 f.). The usual dating for the Zakar inscr. and its picture of Syrian turmoil has placed it before Adad-nirari's campaign, with question as to the identity of 'Mari' in the Damascene dynasty. For that dating see Meyer (*GA* 2, 2, 344 ff., esp. p. 346, n. 1), who finds no connexion between that revolt of the Syrian states against Damascus and Jehoash's reign, *ca.* 798-783,

and so brands the present Biblical passage as 'worthless,' on the ground that by his reign not Ben-Hadad, but Mari was king of Damascus. But this Aramæan name='milord,' has been recognized by many (e.g., Winckler, Kittel, Lods) as the title which has replaced the royal name in current language. As against Meyer's scepticism R. de Vaux argues in a monograph on 'La chronologie de Hazaël et de Benhadad III rois de Damas' (*RB* 1934, 512 ff.), that on epigraphical grounds the inscription is to be placed later, well after 805 B.C., in the following half-century of Assyrian withdrawal from Syrian affairs. He would identify 'Mari' with Hazael himself, noting an ivory plaque found at Arslan-Tash in loot taken from Damascus with the inscription לְהוּאֵל מֶרַאן, 'of our lord Hazael,' and place his son Ben-Hadad after that date, contemporary with Jehoash. That is, the insurrection of those Syrian states against Damascus gave opportunity to the Israelite king. **25a**. He took again out of the hand of Ben-Hadad ben Hazael the cities which he (the latter) had taken out of the hand of his father Jehoahaz by war. The addition, **25b**, Three times did Jehoash smite him, and he recovered the cities of Israel, aligns with the story of Elisha's magical operation. Note the parallel in Mesha's inscr., in which, l. 8, speaking of the land of Mehdeba, he says, using the same verb, "Chemosh recovered it in my days." The whole futility of the internecine Syro-Palestinian politics as also of the internal disturbances is further exhibited in the next chapter. Tiglath-pileser found an easy field for his conquests, and Assyrian imperialism has its apology.

1. '23d year': Jos., '21st year.'—על ישראל: 6 om., 5^H ✕; but it occurs regularly, exc. in I. 16¹⁵ (St.).—2. תַּטְאָה=Grr.; but correct to תַּטְאָה in agreement with foll. מַטְנָה=B† απ αυτης=C; al., απ αυτων; cf. vv. 6, 11.—3. מוֹשִׁיעַ: Grr., σωτηριαν (vs. Lagarde), exc. n v, σωτηρα=5^H.—וַיִּצְאֻ: Hex.; 6 κ. εξηλεν; 6^L κ. εξηλεν αυτους=C; corresponding corrections, with Klost., St., are unnecessary.—6. תַּטְאָה Ginsb., BH: מַטְאָה Ken., Mich., Bär, with same Kr.=VSS; תַּטְאָה demanded by foll. בָּה; the latter preserved in B† εν αυτη.—[וַיִּרְבְּעַם]: 9 MSS om.=7^L 5. —הַלֶּךְ . . . אֲשֶׁר: 6^L om.—הַרְבִּי: many MSS הרביע.—הַלֶּךְ=6 (B i); al. Grr.=תִּלְכִי=al. VSS, which is to be accepted.—7. הַשְׂאִיר: Grr., 5 Y as though נִשְׂאֵר; a translation demanded by the preceding insertion; see Comm.—וַיִּשְׁמַט=6 Gr. MSS; B A al. by early error with pl. verb.—6^L transfers v.²³ after v.⁷, which change Burn.,

St. accept; Šanda properly denies the shift.—10. 'the 37th year': Gr. N+13 MSS, '39th'; c₂, '40th'; v, '36th.'—'16 years': Š^H '13,' by misreading.—11. המאות: many MSS and the sing. again is to be read, with Ⓞ (B A al.), Š^H.—12. נבחרו אשר נלחם: cf. I. 16²⁷, 22⁴⁶; Gr. εποίησεν for the verb is reminiscent of those passages.—13. וירבעם ישב על כבאו: see Comm. for this evident intrusion; Begrich, *Chronologie*, 191, would retain it as original. The insertion involved foll. introduction of 'Joash' as necessary subject; 'Joash' is absent in 1 MS and in Ⓞ Ⓞ^L (Š^H ✕). B has a very corrupt text here.—16. למלך ישראל: Ⓞ om. 'Israel,' but not in the parallel, v.¹⁸, where VSS also vary.—17. התלון: without א.א.—קרינה: Š^H asterisks, prob. from faulty copy.—בארם: for this use of ב 'in hostile sense' see GB 8ob; Ⓞ^L, revising, 'in Israel,' preferred by Klost., Benz.—והבית: B† παραξει.—באפק: Ehrl. (cf. BH) attempts to save by rdg. באפק, 'as it was at Aphek.'—18. החצים: Ⓞ^L amplifies to 'five arrows,' to connect with 'five times' of v.¹⁹; see Rahlfs, SS 3, 245.—19. להכות: the inf. properly defended by Burn., St.; cf. Dr., *Tenses*, §204; the Gr. (=Ⓞ) has suggested to Klost., Haupt., al., the rdg. ולו הקיף.—20. נגורו: MS 187 נגורו=Ⓞ, induced by the sing. in v.²¹.—גָּא שָׁנָה: Gr., ελθοντος τ. ενιαυτου; Ⓞ 'at the coming of the year'=EVV; Ⓞ 'in ipso anno.' Many corrections have been proposed, see Burn., St. at length; Burn., גָּבֹא שָׁנָה; St., שָׁנָה (abs. inf.) בָּא שָׁנָה: Kit. (cf. BH), שָׁנָה בִשְׁנָה; but בָּא שָׁנָה may be read with the inf. as locative of time.—21. וילך: Gr., κ. επορευθη, exc. Ⓞ^L with a doublet, κ. εφυγον κ. ηλθε; Š^H has the pl., with gloss from Sym., treating the verb as passive; and so 1 MS (deR). Read with athnah, וַיִּלְכֵי, with Then., al., the Waw having been lost by haplog.—22. מִן אָדָם: Ⓞ om.—Ad fin. Ⓞ^L+κ. ελαβεν Αζαηλ τον αλλοφυλον εκ χειρος αυτου απο θαλασσης της καθ εσπεραν εως Αφεκ. St., following Wellh., has accepted this as original material, translating it into Heb. in SBOT. But see Rahlfs's drastic criticism (SS 3, 289, cf. Šanda), pointing out that Luc. misunderstood 'the sea of the Arabah,' 14²⁵, as 'the sea of the West,' i.e., the Mediterranean, and so similarly at 25⁴⁻⁵ with 'the Arabah' = 'the West'; he introduced the same terminology here, but the Philistines never extended to Aphek, itself an invention taken from v.¹⁷.—23. וזא אבה: 1 MS+יהוא=Gr., Ⓞ Α.—עַד עֵתָה: Gr. om., Š^H ✕.—25. במלחמה: Ⓞ^L replaces the foll. Heb. with invented midrash: "And Ioas smote the son of Ader, son of Azael thrice in the battle at Aphek according to the word of the Lord, and recovered the cities of Israel and what he took," and then attaches 14^{15, 16}.

14¹⁻²². The reign of Amaziah of Judah. || 2 Ch. 25; cf. *Ant.*, ix, 9. VV.¹⁻⁴. Introductory regnal data. 2. Ascription of *twenty-nine years* to the reign is impossible. The 'twenty' appears to have been introduced from the preceding figure of

the young king's age, 20 (and 5). Such is the judgment of Rost, *KAT* 320; Kittel, *GVI* 2, 213; Robinson, *HI* 1, 461 f. The recent special studies of the chronology have their particular solutions. Lewy (pp. 11 ff.) assigns a reign of 13 years, with assumption of Amaziah's retirement from active rule upon his defeat by Jehoash, with his son Azariah acting as regent; this would account for the unique statement in v.¹⁷ that he *lived after the death of Jehoash . . . fifteen years, i.e., 13+15=28/29*. Begrich (149 ff.) holds that the synchronism in v.¹⁷ is unhistorical (indeed it can hardly be archival), and has affected the term here; the accession in the 2nd year of Jehoash, who reigned 16 years (13¹⁰), *i.e., 16-2=14*, and 14+15=29; he assigns the king 16 years. Mowinckel (pp. 240 ff.) supports the Biblical figure with reduction of the successor Azariah's term by 10 years, *i.e., a reign of 19 years*.

3. The v. recovers its original form by bracketing an early interpolation: *And he did the right in the eyes of YHWH [yet not like David his father], like all that his father Joash had done he did*, the exception to his character being based on v.⁴.

5. 6. The record of the punishment of his father's murderers, when he got in control of state affairs—the assassins, *his servants*, having still remained in his court—is interesting history. V.⁶, with citation from the Law, Dt. 24¹⁶, is a moralizing addition; at the most we might retain *and the murderers' sons he did not slay* as historic fact. 7. *He smote Edom in the Valley of Salt, ten thousand, and seized the Rock [Heb. sela' = EVV Sela] by battle; and he [or impersonal = they] called its name Jokteel unto this day*. We have here, with the possible exception of the last sentence, as again in v.²², a true archival item in its original form. Unrecognizable in modern translations is the introductory emphatic *he* of the Hebrew; *cf.* Mesha's repeated emphatic 'I' in his inscription; in the transcription the first person was changed to the third; a more extensive case occurs in 18⁴. See the writer's article, 'Archival Data in Kings,' esp. p. 50. The locations of *the Valley of Salt* and *the Rock* have long been problems. The former region was the scene of David's great victory over Edom, 2 Sam. 8¹³. It may be a general name for the valley to the S of the Dead Sea; it has been identified with 'Ain-milḥ, *ca.* 30 km. W of Petra, in a wady, which would

be on the route of the Judæan army (so Šanda). Identification of *the Rock* with famous Petra goes back to G with τ . $\pi\epsilon\tau\rho\alpha\nu = \text{P}$ 'petram'; see Robinson, *BR* 2, 573 ff.; Döllner, *GES* 265 f.; *BDD* s.v. 'Sela'; others have doubted the identification, e.g., Buhl, *Gesch. d. Edomiter*, 34 f., Kittel, Eissfeldt. But Glueck has successfully made the point that the place is one of the overhanging heights of the valley in which the later notable city Petra lay, Umm el-Biyārah, the ancient acropolis, as 'now archæologically established' (*AASOR* 14, 77; 15, 82, etc.; cf. Abel, *GP* 2, 407 f.). Strabo, xvi, 4, 21, speaks of the city's site as $\kappa\acute{\iota}\kappa\lambda\omega\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \pi\acute{\epsilon}\tau\rho\alpha\ \phi\rho\omicron\nu\rho\omicron\nu\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\nu$, and hence its later name. Glueck well compares the 'parable' of Balaam against the Kenite, Num. 24²¹: "Enduring thy habitation, and set in the rock (*sela'*) thy nest (*hēn*)," the last word playing on 'Kenite,' i.e., the Smith-clan, which worked the rich copper mines of that region, as Glueck has demonstrated. For a full presentation of the topography of Petra, richly illustrated, see Mrs. G. Horsfield's monograph, vol. 7 (1938) of *Quarterly of the Dept. of Antiquities in Palestine* (cf. review in *AJA* 1938, 565); also is to be noticed (Mrs.) M. A. Murray, *Petra, the Rock City of Edom*, 1938. The figure of '10,000 Edomites' is a customary round number; cf. the same figure in 13⁷; in David's battle in the same locality the figure of his victims is put at 18,000, but this appearing in the title of Ps. 60 as 12,000—so little reliable is numerical tradition. Ch. has a playful midrash here, how they brought the ten thousand "to the top of the rock, and cast them down from the top of the rock, and they were all broken up." Jokteel is not otherwise known (a city of that name in Judah, Josh. 15³⁸).

VV.⁸⁻¹⁴. Amaziah's challenge to Jehoash and his undoing by the latter. The success of the two kings, of the one over Edom, of the other over Aram, provoked envious hostility; Amaziah would naturally have desired to clear Transjordan of Israel—a fatuous policy. 8. Amaziah's challenge, *Let us see one another face to face*, is couched in the knightly language of the duello; cf. I. 20¹¹. 9. 10. Jehoash retorts like a superior gentleman with a brief and incisive fable, with which cf. Jotham's more extensive harangue, Jud. 9⁷⁻¹⁵. The Israelite strain of the fable was native, as such cases prove; see further on I. 5^{9ff.}. The actors in the fable are *the thistle in Lebanon*,

the cedar in Lebanon, the wild beasts in Lebanon; it is hyper-criticism on Stade's part, followed by Šanda, to excise *in Lebanon* 2^o and 3^o. The application of the parable is equally curt: *The smiting of Edom thou hast wrought, and thy heart would lift thee up* [cf. EVV]. *Enjoy thy glory* [one word in Heb. and contemptuous in form], *and stay at home* [Heb. *in thy house*]. *And why wouldst thou challenge evil?* The last verb is in line with the tr. of פ, 'provocas,' and so RVV^{mg}, 'provoke calamity,' Moffatt, 'provoke trouble,' Chic. B., 'court trouble.' The verb presents the self-excitation of the champion, cf. the picture of YHWH rousing himself to war, Is. 42¹³; the same verb is used of starting war with an opponent, Dt. 2⁹⁻²⁴, cf. Dan. 11¹⁰⁻²⁵. The renderings of EVV with the verb 'to meddle' are weak. **11.** The contestants met *face to face . . . at Beth-shemesh of Judah, i.e.,* modern 'Ainshems, W of Jerusalem, the railroad passing close by it on the ancient thoroughfare from the sea to that city. For an archæological study of the site see E. Grant, *Beth Shemesh* (1929), and *Ain Shems Excavations*, Part I (1931); cf. Abel, *GP* 2, 282. Cook has well observed that the determinant, literally, *which is Judah's*, is from the northern point of view (*JBL* 51 [1932], 283 f.). **12. 13.** Judah was defeated, *they fled every one home* (cf. I. 12¹⁶), and Amaziah was taken prisoner. The victor proceeded to Jerusalem, and arriving, *he dismantled the wall of Jerusalem from the Ephraim Gate to the Corner Gate, 400 cubits*. For these gates see Smith, *Jerusalem*, Indices, s.v. 'Gates,' e.g., 2, 116, 119, and M. Burrows's studies, 'A Source for the Topography of Ancient Jerusalem,' *AASOR* 14 (1935), e.g., pp. 118, 134, 137, and 'The Topography of Neh. 12, 31-43,' *JBL* 54 (1935), 29 ff. The Ephraim Gate lay in the north wall, and according to the above authorities the Corner Gate was at the NE angle. But there would have been little reason for the northern victor to demolish a gate there, and Šanda, following Schick, would find the gate in question at the NW angle, and would accept the 400 cubits as a fairly correct figure for the distance between the two gates; however, the figure may present only a partial demolition. Cf. Uzziah's restorations as reported by 2 Ch. 26⁹, the building of towers at the Corner Gate, the Valley Gate, the Angle Gate. **14.** Jerusalem's

temple and palaces suffer their third despoliation, since Shishak (I. 14^{25ff.}) and Hazael (12¹⁹). *Hostages* are mentioned, uniquely in Biblical history.

VV.¹⁵⁻¹⁶. The data for the end of Jehoash's reign. For the original position here of the section, see Comm., 13¹²⁻¹³.

VV.¹⁷⁻²². The remainder of Amaziah's reign, and his assassination. 17. For the synchronism see above on v.². 19. *And they made a conspiracy against him in Jerusalem*: the second assassination of a Judæan monarch, following that of the father (12²¹⁻²²), the conspiracy here being stated impersonally. We may only speculate again, as in the father's case, upon the motive of the conspiracy, which was persistent to the extreme; but it was no popular cause, as v.²¹ shows. *And he fled to Lachish, and they sent after him to Lachish, and they killed him there*. Lachish, long identified with Tell el-Hesi, as in F. J. Bliss's volume, *A Mound of Many Cities* (1894), is now definitely located at Tell ed-Duweir, 8 km. SW of Beit-jibrîn, where a remarkable discovery of Hebrew ostraca of Jeremiah's age has been made. Two pertinent volumes on Lachish are available (see Bibliography, *s.v.*), the first with Preface on 'The Discovery' by the late lamented J. L. Starkey; see also Albright, *BASOR* 68 (1937), 22 ff.; R. S. Haupt, *BA* 1 (1938), 21 ff., and for the earlier literature Abel, *GP* 2, 367 f. Mention of Lachish also recurs in 18¹⁴. 20. *And they brought him upon horses, and he was buried in Jerusalem with his fathers in David's City*. The first sentence is obscure, and Winckler, followed by Haupt (*cf. BH*), would insert it before *and he fled* in v.¹⁹; but Šanda's suggestion of a solemn funeral procession back to Jerusalem is quite to the point. 21. A note on the succession to the throne: *And all the people of Judah took Azariah, who was sixteen years old, and made him king in place of his father Amaziah*. The v. presents a unique political datum; *cf.* the part played by 'the people of the land' in Jehoash's accession (11^{17ff.}). For the name Azariah and the variant Uzziah see Comm., 15¹. 22. *He built Elath, and restored it to Judah, after that the king slept with his fathers*. The usual interpretation, so *e.g.*, Then., Kittel, is that the son promptly completed his father's interrupted operation, but the time note, with *the king* as subject, is most obscure. Six Gr. MSS introduce

Amaziah's name as the subject, followed by Winckler, Šanda. Skinner most arbitrarily suggests Jeroboam as the original subject. But the record of the restoration of Elath is another archival datum, beginning with the emphatic *he*, without previous conjunction, and doubtless stood once in the same official record as v. 7. It became detached, was by haphazard restored here. The following temporal sentence is clumsy editorial reflection on the misplacing of the item. For *Elath* (by the older pronunciation) see on Eloth, I. 9²⁶. But the famous harbour was to be lost again to Aram (16⁶).

VV.²³⁻²⁹. The reign of Jeroboam II of Israel. Cf. *Ant.*, ix, 10, 1, 2. **23**. For the length of the reign, 41 years, there is no variation in the VSS; Jos. makes it the round figure 40. **24-27**. The usual condemnation of members of the Northern dynasties (v. 24) is followed by an archival datum of Jeroboam's recovery of Israelite territory from Aram. **25a**. *He* [the Heb. emphatic pronoun] *restored the border of Israel from the Entrance of Hamath unto the Sea of the Arabah*. The ideal limits of Israel's territory are here expressed; cf. Am. 6¹⁴, etc. The Entrance of Hamath is the opening from the south into the Beḳā', the great valley between the two Lebanon ranges (see Eissfeldt, *R. Schamra u. Sanchuniathon*, 32 f., citing a study by Noth in *ZDPV* 58 (1935), 185 ff.; E. Robinson understood it as of the northern end of the valley, *LBR* 568, cf. Burney, *Judges*, 63). To this item is attached a prophetic oracle: **25b**. *according to the word of YHWH, God of Israel, which he spoke through his servant the prophet, Jonah ben Amittai, of Gath-hepher*; this continued with an explanation of the divine clemency: **26**. *For YHWH saw that Israel's affliction was very bitter; for there was 'none shut up nor left at large' [so RVV JV; see Note], and no helper for Israel;* **27**. *and YHWH spoke not for blotting out Israel's name from under heaven; and he saved them by the hand of Jeroboam ben Joash*. This oracle of a nationalistically minded prophet must be original, however inexact the present phrasing may be.¹

¹ Later to this historical Jonah the prophetic book of that name with its burden against Nineveh came to be assigned. For Jonah's home town (also Josh. 19¹³), between Sepphoris and Tiberias, from of old connected with the prophet's memory, as Jerome reports, see Dalman, *Sacred Sites and Ways*, 111.

There is to be noted T. H. Robinson's remark (*HI* I, 359, n. 1): "This must have been written before 734 B.C." Jonah took a contrary view to that of his contemporaries, Amos and Hosea; the former (6¹³) condemned the braggadocio of the national revival: "who rejoice in Lo-debar, and say, Have we not taken Karnaim to ourselves?" (the places named are Trans-jordanic). And according to Amos 8¹⁴ the far northern shrine of Dan was still flourishing. 28. The political expansion is further eked out in the concluding summary of *the acts of Jeroboam . . . how he warred, and how he restored Damascus and Hamath 'for Judah in Israel'* [*sic!*]. The reference to Judah is unintelligible (*cf.* AV RVV); the passage is generally reduced by critics to *to Israel* (and thus long ago S). The note of the 'restoration' of distant Hamath as well as of Damascus is absurd; various rewritings of the passage have been attempted (see Note). If there be any traditional reminiscence, we might think of recovery of old-time territorial markets in Damascus (*cf.* I. 20³⁴).² But the revival was socially and economically unsound, and Amos and Hosea foresaw the debacle. The black night that followed has obscured the temporary glory of the reign; as Olmstead observes (*HPS* 420): "In the few lines grudgingly vouchsafed by the editor of Kings to Jeroboam II . . . we glimpse one of the mightiest rulers of Israel." The Biblical information on this reign is meagre enough. The one item presented above fits into the scheme of Assyria's movement westward against the Syrian states. The Eponym Canon itemizes attacks upon Damascus in 773 B.C., Hadrach in 772, and again in 765, 755, and Arpad in 754. The last campaign is brilliantly illustrated by a native Aramaic document, found at Sūjīn in 1931 (*Comm.*, I. 18, p. 299, n. 2). It presents a humiliating treaty imposed by the conqueror upon the local king of Ktk (?) along with Mata'ilu king of Arpad, and is parallel to a similar Assyrian document on the same subject. For the history of this period *cf.* Alt's study, 'Die syrische Staatenwelt vor dem Einbruch der Assyrer.' The continuous suppression of the Syrian states,

² For Hamath see Dussaud, *TH* 233 ff., and for H. Ingholt's long series of excavations there his *Rapport préliminaire sur sept campagnes de fouilles à Hama en Syrie* (1932-38), *Memoirs of the Danish Royal Academy*, Copenhagen, 1940.

later renewed by the advent of Tiglath-pileser (745 B.C.), gave Israel opportunity for revenge against Syria in Jeroboam's reign (ca. 783-743 B.C.).

2. שנה: for abnormal sing. see 8¹⁷.—יהוערין Kt.=Grr.; יהוערין K̄r.=Ch. and other VSS; for the name see Noth, *IP* 267; a Minæan name, ערין, appears (*NPS* I, 157).—3. עשה bis: 2 MSS om. 1⁰, 1 MS om. 2⁰.—4. טרו: as at 12⁴.—5. תשלך: Ⓢ Ⓢ^L om by simplification, in line with Ch.—6. יומתו bis; יומת Kt., יוקח. K̄r.: for the variations in K̄al and Hofal cf. the original law in Dt. 24¹⁶, and the parallel in Ch.; for the variations in MSS, edd., VSS see *BH*, notes *ad loca*, and deR., St. at length.—כי אגז: MSS כי=Ch.; see deR.—7. תשלך: K̄r. תלך, and so many MSS, as in 2 Sam. 8¹³, Ps. 60²; the Kt. induced by Ch.; Grr. have barbarous transliterations of ניא הגו; Aq., Sym. translate.—ורפש: for the consecution see the writer's art. cited in Comm.; the form is original, vs. critics.—הכיע: Ⓢ *Kerakka*, by identification with Kir-haresheth, for which identification see Abel, *GP* 2, 418.—תקחאל: see Note on יקחש, I. 4¹²; the name is identical with יקחיאל, 1 Ch. 4¹⁸, with verbal element=Arab. *kūt*, 'to nourish.'—'unto this day': cf. I. 8⁸, II. 8²², 16⁶.—8. או שלה: see Note, I. 9²⁴.—פיניש: פ' אל פ' is the usual expression.—9. הרוח: the Grr., exc. one Origenian rdg., have a primitive abbreviation of *καταθος*, B *al.*, *ακαν*, Ⓢ^L texts *ακαχαν*.—10. ותשאך לבך: for the consecution see Dr., *Tenses*, 141.—לבך הבבר: Ⓢ Ⓢ^H correctly for the verb, *επδοξασθητι*; Ⓢ^L has a triplet rendering of the verb: *η καρδια σου η βαρεια* (=תקבר) *επδοξασθητι bis*, the final repetition appearing to be due to gloss correction; see Rahlfs, *SS* 3, 198. Ch. has for the verb תִּקְבְּרִי, generally corrected to תִּקְבְּרִי. There is no reason to correct the text with Klost., cf. *BH*.—11. יהואש: B† om., Ⓢ^H ✕.—הוא ואמצייתו מלך יהודה: Gr. MSS 44 71 om., Ⓢ^H ✕; vs. St., the prolixity may well be original.—12. לאהלו: Kt. לֹאֲהֵלוּ=Grr. (exc. x y), Ⓢ^H Ⓢ A; K̄r. לֹאֲהֵלוּ=Ch., Ⓢ Y; Kt. is correct, cf. 8²¹.—13. מלך יהודה: OGr. om., Ⓢ^H ✕.—בן יהואש בן אחיזה: Ⓢ texts (B *al.*) have the double patronymic probably intruded from Ch.; but the Gr. used by Ⓢ^H omitted the second one.—ויבאו: Kt., ויקח K̄r.: Ⓢ Ⓢ=K̄r.; Ⓢ^H=Kt.; K̄r. is to be preferred in the consecution. Ⓢ^L Y follow Ch., ויביאהו, which Burn., St. accept without sufficient reason.—בשער: Ⓢ Ⓢ^H Ⓢ^H; some 10 MSS Ken., deR. (Ginsburg as Or.), משער=Ch., and the other VSS; the latter is to be accepted; the case one of labial variation.—14. ולקח: it is easy to correct to ויקח; but Ch. om. the verb, as does one Lucianic MS here, and there may have been an original lacuna here, which was supplied in this fashion.—15. אשר: 9 MSS, Ⓢ as א' ובל; cf. 13⁸.—אשר: 1 MS, Grr., Y as אשר.—18. אמצייתו: Grr.+ "and all that he did."—23. מלך ישראל: 19 MSS Ken., deR., מ' על א', acc. to the correct formula=Ⓢ Ⓢ^H Ⓢ^H Ⓢ^L.—24. מבל השאות: for the noun MSS השאת, to be read as

sing. ; cf. 13¹¹, etc. G^L om. כל, prob. finding an exception in view of the divine favour to the reign.—25. הערבה: G^L *προς εσπεραν*; see Note, 13²².—26. כָּרָה: VSS, modern tr., 'bitter,' but the form is impossible; see *SBOT* for attempted revisions, of which Burn.'s תָּרָה is simplest.—אָפַס עֵצוֹר וְאָפַס עֵוֹב: for the phrase see Note, I. 14¹⁰. Eissf. well tr. with "allesamt waren dahin." G understood אָפַס as adj. and so: *ολιγοστους* (correcting B) *συννεχομενους* κ. *εσπανισμενους* (these two ppls. a doublet='being in want') κ. *εγκαταλελειμενους*, which G^L reduced by omitting κ. *εσπαν.*—27. עַם: Gr. by primitive error, *σπερμα* = S^H , exc. G^L , *ονομα.*—28. וְאִשֶׁר הִשִּׁיב אֶת דְּמֹשֶׁקֶת:—אִשֶׁר נָלַח: Gr. variations here as in 13¹².—אִשֶׁר נָלַח: of the VSS S A alone give reasonable sense by omitting 'to Judah' and rdg. 'to Israel.' But 'Judah' of the text remains a conundrum, and all correction is arbitrary. For various rewritings see Burn., St. The former's revision, accepted by Šanda, reads in tr.: "and how he fought with Damascus, and how he turned away Y.'s wrath from Israel"; but Jeroboam as diverter of the divine wrath is most improbable.

Ch. 15. For the brilliant light cast upon this and the following ch. from the inscriptions of Tiglath-pileser III (IV), 745-727 B.C., see the texts in *CIOT* 1, 208 ff.; *KB* 2, 2 ff.; *ARA* 1, ch. 14; *ATB* 1, 113 ff., and in selection, *CP* 308 ff.; *AKAT* 172 ff.; *AB* 463 ff. For this Assyrian phase of Biblical history, in addition to the Histories, *au courant*, is to be consulted Dhorme, 'Les pays bibliques et l'Assyrie,' in six sections, *RB* 7, 8 (1910-11). For text criticism of cc. 15-21 see Stade, *ZAW* 6 (1886), 156 ff. = *Akad. Reden*, 201 ff.

VV.¹⁻⁷. The reign of Azariah-Uzziah of Judah. || 2 Ch. 26 (with a long insertion, vv.⁵⁻¹⁹); cf. *Ant.*, ix, 10, 3, 4. 1. The king's name appears below intermittently as Uzziah, vv. 13. 30. 32. 34 (but with variations in MSS), and so throughout Ch., except in the Davidic family-tree (I. 3¹²), and in Amos, Hosea, Isaiah. Azariah is evidently the throne-name, Uzziah an adopted name, or possibly a popular *alias* with play on the roots, 'help' in the first case, 'might' in the second, the latter as a result of the king's triumphs.¹ The name of Azariah of Judah has produced a vexed problem because of

¹ For such changes of royal names cf. Jedidiah-Solomon, Shallum-Joahaz, Eliakim-Jehoiakim, Mattaniah-Sedekiah. There is also the change of name of Assyrian kings upon accession to the throne of Babylon, of Tiglath-pileser as Pul (cf. v.¹⁹ below), of Shalmaneser IV as Ululai, of Ashurbanipal as Kandalanu; see the Babylonian King List A, *KB* 2, 286 f.

the appearance of a contemporary Azriau of Ya'ūdi in Tiglath-pileser's Annals for the year 738 (see *KB* 2, 27; *ATB* 1, 345; *ARA* 1, §770; *CP* 314; *AB* 463). Early interpretations naturally identified this figure with the Judæan king, so e.g., Schrader in *CIOT*. But Winckler, in his *Altor. Forschungen*, I, 1 ff. (cf. *KAT* 54), upset this view by identification of Ya'ūdi with the home-land of Panammūwa king of Y'di, later Sam'al, in far North Syria, inscriber of two lengthy Aramaic inscriptions (known by the names of Hadad, the father, and Panammūwa, the son [see Bibliography, xli]), the second of which records the king's presence at Tiglath-pileser's triumph in Damascus in the year 732. This identification has since been generally accepted by historians, e.g., by Rogers (*CP* 311), and by Gray in his Comm. on Isaiah (pp. lxix seq.). A vigorous denial of this change of interpretation was entered by Luckenbill in *AJSL* 41 (1925), 217 ff., and his judgment, although drastically condemned by Meyer, has been stoutly endorsed by Noth (*IP* 109 f.). But the Assyrian's boastful report of a devastating campaign against Ya'ūdi can only with extreme strain be interpreted as referring to far-off Judah. For the interesting parallelism of names Gray notes from Ass. inscriptions that of Menahem of Israel, and so of Shomeron, for the year 738, and Menahem of Samsimuruna for 701. As for the northern name Azriau, if its final element be the divine *Yahu*, a parallel exists in the name of an Aramæan king known from Sargon's inscriptions, with the variation Ilu-bidi/Yau-bidi (see Noth, *ib.*, 110, n. 3). But there are to be recalled the older Heb. inscription of Kilammūwa in North Syria, and the Hebraizing Aramaic inscription of Zakar of Hamath, and we may possibly assume wandering knights of fortune from the far south; cf. the relations of Toi king of Hamath with David, according to 1 Ch. 18^{9f.}, also the reference to Hamath above, 14²⁸. And so Meyer (*GA* 3, 28; cf. n. 4) recognizes Yau-bidi, 'the bad Hittite' of the Ass. text, as 'ein israelitischer Reisläufer.'²

This historical summary is extraordinarily brief for a long reign, containing the one unique item of the king's physical

² For identification of the divine element in those names with Bab. Yaum, and Yao of Abraxas gems, see *KAT* 66, and Eissf., *R. Schamra u. Sanch.*, 17.

affliction. On the other hand Ch. has a long list of the king's achievements with a large and admirably equipped army against the Philistines and Arabians (he was indeed relieved from the pressure of Aram and Israel), and of his building operations in Jerusalem and throughout the kingdom, he himself appearing as an amateur of agriculture; but for his vaulting ambition in presuming to offer the incense-sacrifice in the temple (a datum in the constant feud between royalty and priesthood), he was smitten with leprosy on his forehead, and so excluded from his office. For 'The Sin of Uzziah' see Morgenstern, *HUCA* 12-13 (1938), 1 ff. There is hardly question but that Ch. has drawn from excellent ancient sources at least for the secular details of this account. We might assume an early lacuna in the tradition of our book.

5. *And YHWH smote the king, and he was stricken with leprosy unto the day of his death; and he dwelt in a house set apart:* so for the final phrase JV; EVV Chic. B., 'in a several/separate house' (=GV FV); more explicitly RV^{mg} has 'in a lazar house,' RV^{Am. mg}, 'in an infirmary'; Moffatt tr. the final term with 'unmolested.' For the archival item, with definite legal phraseology, of the king's malady *cf.* the annalistic report in the Babylonian Chronicle concerning a king of Elam, who "suffered with a stroke, his mouth was closed and he could not speak" (col. iii, lines 20 f.; *KB* 2, 280; Rogers, *CP* 214). The statement on the king's habitat, as generally translated, suggests a condition 'in quarantine'; but see Comm. on Naaman's case (5¹). The Heb.= 'in the house of x,' and the noun in question='freedom'; *cf.* the use of the corresponding adj. in 1 Sam. 17²⁵, generally interpreted as civically 'free.' The phrase here may be rendered, *in the status* [with extended sense of Heb. *house*] *of exemption, i.e.,* from royal, sacred and civic duties, which a diseased man (as in the history of even modern royalty) might not exercise (and so Kimchi recognized). See the writer's brief article on 'Soul Gods,' *HTR* 34 (1941), 321 f., and Note below, with an interesting Ugaritic parallel. In these circumstances *the king's son Jotham was Over-the-House* [*cf.* I. 4⁶], *Judge of the people of the land*, the latter title probably a technical term for regency. A remarkable archæological sequel to this record has been discovered by E. L. Sukenik in a small museum in

Jerusalem ; see his report in *QS* 1931, 217 ff., and *cf.* Albright, *BASOR* 44 (1931), 8 ff. This is a stone with an Aramaic inscription reading : " Hither were brought the bones of Uzziah king of Judah." *Cf.* the rather cryptic note on his burial in Ch., v.²³. It was in this royal death-year that Isaiah had the vision of his call (Is. 6¹).

VV.⁸⁻¹². The reign of Zechariah of Israel. For vv.⁸⁻³¹ *cf.* *Ant.*, ix, II, 1. According to v.¹² this reign, terminating the dynasty of Jehu, fulfilled the divine word in 10³⁰. **10.** The social confusion throughout the Levant in face of the Assyrian terror was the background of the king's murder, in the conspiracy of a certain Shallum, who *attacked him at Jibleam [=G¹, H before people > current rendering, before the people], and killed him.* For the place, also the scene of Ahaziah's murder by Jehu, *cf.* 9²⁷ ; for the correction see Note. For these last kings, Zechariah to Hoshea, the burial of Menahem alone is recorded. VV.¹³⁻¹⁶. The reign of Shallum of Israel, plus an archival datum concerning his murderer and successor Menahem. Shallum was done away with after a reign of *a full month* (Heb. *a month of days*). **14.** *And Menahem ben Gadi came up from Tirsah [the one-time royal residence, I. 15²¹], and came to Samaria, and attacked Shallum ben Jabesh in Samaria, and killed him, and reigned in his stead.* Then after the usual editorial sequel on *the acts of Shallum* (v.¹⁵) comes an item, v.¹⁶, with the introductory archival *then*, anticipating the history of Menahem's reign in vv.^{17ff.}. It may have been originally collocated with v.¹⁴ ; *cf.* the displacement of such an item in 14²². **16.** The difficulty of the v. is evident from the tr. of AV with its italicization of essential additions for sense, here represented in brackets : *Then Menahem smote Tiphseh and all that were therein, and the coasts thereof from Tirsah ; because they opened not [to him], therefore he smote [it ; and] all the women with child therein he ripped up ;* and so the text of RVV JV, but without the italics of AV. In every aspect the v. is obscure, as all VSS prove ; the verb *opened* is masc. sing., and the range of the geographical items is problematic. Tiphseh has been naturally, if absurdly, identified with Tiphseh-Thapsacus on the Euphrates of I. 5⁴ (see Poole, and Rawlinson, *ad loc.*). The now generally accepted correction is to Tappuah, based

on the transliteration in \mathfrak{S}^L . But with Tirsah belonging to Manasseh and Tappuah (also in Shishak's list, no. 39) in the extreme north of Ephraim (Jos. 16⁸, 17⁸—for the two places see Abel, *GP* 2, 475, 485), there remains the problem of such a barbarous raid carried out between two such closely neighbouring cities. Šanda would relieve the passage by excising *from Tirsah* as an interpolation from v.¹⁴. The problem remains why there was such an early snarl in a presumably simple text. The savage cruelty against pregnant women was typical of those days of the Assyrian terror; it was expected from Hazael (8¹²), practised on Israel by Ammon (Am. 1¹³), and was to be part of Israel's final tragedy (Hos. 14¹).

VV.¹⁷⁻²². The reign of Menahem of Israel. 18. The punctuation at end of the v. must be corrected along with word-corrections, following the Grr. *And he did the evil in the sight of YHWH, he turned not from all the sin [H away from the sins] of Jeroboam ben Nebat, for which he made Israel liable. In his days [H all his days] 19. came Pul king of Assyria against the land, and Menahem gave to Pul a thousand talents of silver, that his hand [H hands] might be with him to confirm the kingdom in his hand. 30. And Menahem exacted the silver against Israel, against all the magnates of wealth—to give to the king of Assyria—fifty shekels of silver per person; and the king of Assyria turned back and stayed not there in the land.* A unique contemporary touch appears in the item with the alternate name for Tiglath-pileser. Acc. to 1 Ch. 5²⁶ the two names represented distinct persons, and such was the natural understanding until quite recent times, as e.g., with Rawlinson, *ad loc.* When Tiglath-pileser finally ascended the distinct throne of Babylon, in 729 B.C., he assumed the name Pūlu, as it appears in the Babylonian King-List A (*CP* 202) with transcription as Πωρον in the parallel Ptolemaic Canon (*Bibliog.*, xlii), and as Φουλος in Eusebius; see P. Schnabel, *Berosos*, 143 f. The tribute of 'Menahem of Samaria' (*n.b.* the novel designation of the kingdom), along with that of the kings of Damascus (Rašūnu—see on v.³⁷), Gebal-Byblos, Hamath, etc., is recorded by the conqueror in his Annals for the year 738. For references for calculation of the money-value of the talent see *Comm.*, I. 10²⁹. Šanda (writing in 1912) calculated the value of the

1000 talents at 16-17 million francs. Mari of Damascus (see Comm., 13^{22π}.) paid Adad-nirari III 2300 talents of silver, 20 of gold, 3000 of copper, 5000 of iron, along with cloth fabrics, ivory furniture, etc. (*KB* 1, 191; *ARA* 1, §740, cf. §735). Given the value of a talent at the minimum figure of 3000 shekels (so Galling, *BR* 186—*cf.* Dt. 22¹⁹, Eze. 45¹²), the 50 shekels poll-tax represents 60,000 taxable persons—an objective side-light on the financial condition of the upper classes, so dramatically denounced by the contemporary Prophets. See further on 18¹⁴ for comparison of this tribute with that of Hezekiah to Sennacherib. *Magnates of wealth* translates the Heb. phrase generally rendered with 'mighty men of valour,' but the ancient military expression had changed its meaning to one of economic significance; cf. I. 11²⁸, II. 24¹⁴, and see Lurje, *Studien*, 17 ff. The adverb *there* indicates a scribe writing outside of the land, with which cf. his use of 'Pul'; see Robinson, *HI* 1, 373, n. 5.

VV.²³⁻²⁶. The reign of Pekahiah ben Menahem of Israel. The only particular event given for the reign is v.²⁵: *And his captain Pekah ben Remaliah conspired against him, and he attacked him in Samaria, in the castle of the royal house, [Ⓐ+ four words] and with him fifty Gileadites; and he slew him, and reigned in his stead.* The excepted words appear in EVV as *with/by Argob and with/by Arieḥ*; see Note for their character as a corrupt gloss to v.²⁹.

VV.²⁷⁻³¹. The reign of Pekah ben Remaliah of Israel. 27. The *twenty years* (entered gloss-wise, without the necessary preface, "and he reigned"—*cf.* EVV) assigned to the reign is an absurdity for a term reduced by most chronologers to two years, by some to five. There appears to have been a learned conspiracy to follow out the laudable scheme of synchronistic history, but impossible with the anarchic conditions of the North. The '20' recurs again in v.^{30b}, although out of place, and vv.³²⁻³³ give the figures, the sum of which is presented by 'the 17th year of Pekah' for Ahaz's succession (16¹). There is reserved for the history of Ahaz the item of the attack of Pekah and Rason of Aram upon Judah (v.³⁷, 16⁵⁻⁶). 29. *In the days of Pekah king of Israel came Tiglath-pileser king of Assyria, and seized Ijon [‘Îyôn] and Abel-beth-maachah and Janoah [Yānôah] and Kedesh and Hasor and*

Gilead and Galilee, all the land of Naphtali, and exiled them to Assyria. Of these places 'Īyôn, Abel-beth-Maachah and 'all the land of Naphtali' are listed along with Chinnereth in I. 15²⁰ (*q.v.*) among the districts seized by Ben-Hadad from Baasha; they had since reverted to Israel. Abel-b.-M. is recorded in the contemporary Ass. list of conquests cited below. For Yānôah, probably modern Yanūh, 10 km. N of Tyre, and Kēdesh, modern Kades, 36 km. E of Tyre, see Albright, *AASOR* 6 (1926), 18 ff.; Abel, *GP* 2, 354, 416; Dussaud, *TH* 23; *per contra*, Buhl, *GAP*, Index, *s.vv.* For Hasor see on I. 9¹⁵. That these far northern cities were still Israelite is of historical interest. *Gilead*, intercepting those northern districts, might possibly be identified with an uncertain place-name (Gala'za) cited below from the Ass. annals, otherwise the word and then the following Galilee are to be elided (so Stade, Eissfeldt); *BH* implies omission of *all the land of Naphtali*. Šanda retains the disputed words, understanding the summary to refer to the three campaigns of Tiglath-pileser; but the order remains geographically irregular. Tiglath-pileser parallels the above precise record in his (fragmentary) Annals: after describing a campaign in Syria (Hadrach, Gebal, Simirra of Gen. 10¹⁸, etc., are named) he continues: "the cities of . . . Gala'za (?), Abilakka (Abel-b.-M.), which are on the border of Bit-Ḥumria (Omri-land) . . . the wide land of Naphtali (?—of the word only the final syllable survives; see Rogers's note) in its entirety I brought within the border of Assyria" (*ARA* 1, §815; *cf.* *KB* 2, 30 ff.; *CP* 320 f.; *AB* 464 f.). The final sentence of the v. is the first mention of a Golah, an exile, in the sad chapters of Israelite history. A prophetic parallel is the reference in Is. 8²³ to the affliction of the land of Zebulun and the land of Naphtali. 30. *And Hoshea ben Elah made a conspiracy against Pekah ben Remaliah, and attacked him, and slew him, and reigned in his stead in the twentieth year of Jotham ben Uzziah.* The date (*cf.* the 'twenty years' in v.²⁷) is absolutely inconsistent with v.³³, according to which Jotham reigned but 16 years (unless years of his regency, v.⁵, were included), and with 17¹, according to which Hoshea succeeded in Ahaz's twelfth year. Lucian expunged the contradictory item, but that gives no basis for textual criticism. See on the passage

as 'Not a Gloss,' W. E. Barnes, *JTS* 8 (1907), 294 ff. These curt items are fortunately eked out by v.³⁷ and 16^{5f.}, and still more fully by the Assyrian annals, revealing the political setting, how Pekah in combination with Aram felt strong enough to defy Assyria, but came to his own undoing by a pro-Assyrian faction among his own people. The Assyrian record continues the citation given above with a chronologically later item, reporting first the insurrection of Hanno of Gaza and the conquest of that city, thus revealing a widespread revolt against Assyrian domination, and then proceeding: "The land of Bit-Ḥumria . . . all its people, together with their goods, I carried off to Assyria, Paḩaḩa their king they deposed, and I placed Ausi' (Hoshea) over them as king. Ten talents of gold, x talents of silver, as their tribute I received from them, and to Assyria I carried them." The Assyrian boastfulness appears in the allegation of an entire deportation, while the domestic origin of the *coup d'état* is ignored. But thus the last king of Israel received formally the throne from the Assyrian conqueror, even as the last of the Judæan dynasty was installed by the Babylonian (24¹⁷).

VV.³²⁻³⁸. The reign of Jotham of Judah. || 2 Ch. 27; cf. *Ant.*, ix, 11, 2. Glueck has discovered at Tell el-Kheleifeh a seal belonging to this period inscribed *LYTM*; it may be read, 'Jotham's,' possibly to be ascribed to this king; see *BASOR* 79 (1940), 13 ff., with plates, and extensive note by Albright on interpretation of the name. The brief history contains two archival items. **35b.** *He* [with emphatic pronoun] *built the Upper Gate of the house of YHWH.* This gate appears in Jer. 20², 'the Gate of Benjamin, the Upper,' probably by double nomenclature, and in Eze. 9², 'the Upper Gate that faces the north,' precised more exactly in 8³ as 'the Gate of the inner court that faces the north'; see Smith, *Jerusalem*, 2, 125, 257. **37.** *In those days YHWH began to send into Judah Rason* [Heb. *Resin*—see Note] *king of Aram and Pekah ben Remaliah.* The v. is out of place between the customary final vv. on the reign. It indicates that the Northern attack on Judah began before the campaign recorded for the next reign (16⁵⁻⁶). Ch. has a good tradition of Jotham's extensive building operations, and of his success over Ammon, laying them under tribute; this may have

been a cause of the Aramæan-Israelite offensive, which however had as its greater object the forcing of Judah into the anti-Assyrian coalition. Note that the hostile attack is ascribed to YHWH's will, but without any moral motivation, as is the case with the Prophets.

1. עוריה: also עוריה below; for replacement with עויה(ו), below, and for constantly varying rdgs. of MSS, edd., and VSS, see deR. For עוריהו in Pal. seals see *IAE* 122, 184, 189, for עויהו *ib.*, 196, 221, 223.—2. יכליהו: the verbal element is pf., with Noth, *IP* 190, *vs.* Kt. of Ch., יכליה, preferred by Šanda.—5. בית החפשיה: 10 MSS, Ch., החפשות; ב' החפשות; OGr. transliterate the last word with $\omega\theta$ for the final syllable; Aq., $\epsilon\nu\ \sigma\iota\kappa\omega\ \epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\theta\epsilon\rho\iota\alpha\varsigma$; Sym., $\kappa.\ \omega\kappa\epsilon\iota\ \kappa\epsilon\kappa\lambda\epsilon\iota\sigma\mu\epsilon\mu\epsilon\sigma$, adopted by \mathfrak{S}^H after the transliterated phrase, and so \mathfrak{A} ; 'the Others,' acc. to MS z, $\kappa\rho\upsilon\phi\alpha\iota\omega\varsigma = \mathfrak{S}$; \mathfrak{T} 'outside of Jerusalem,' and so Jos., 'out of the city'; \mathfrak{P} 'in domo libera seorsum'; Rashi as though = 'free among the dead,' citing Job 3¹⁹; Kimchi interprets as of freedom from office. Klost.'s suggestion to read בביתו חפ , 'in his house in freedom' (adverbial), *i.e.*, from duties, is favourably regarded by some critics (*cf.* Burn., Sk., Šanda, Moff.), but, as St. remarks, "nothing is gained by this revision." The adj. חפשי = 'free,' as of an especially exempt citizen (1 Sam. 17²⁵), and so the word *hubšu* in the Amarna tablets. For discussion of the civic term see Pedersen, *Israel*, I-II, 498 f., Pedersen and Albright, *JPOS* 1926, 103 ff., 106 ff., and the latter in *SAC* 217, and note; also I. Mendelsohn's study of the term in the several languages in *BASOR* 83 (1941), 36 ff., but without reference to the present passage. R. Gordis, in *JQR* 27 (1936), 43 f., regards this as a case of 'contrasted meanings,' the word here expressing 'confinement'; but such explanation is not necessary. Otherwise חפשי is used by extension of other-worldly conditions: in Ps. 88⁶, 'free among the dead,' and Job 3¹⁷, in description of Hades, "small and great are there, and slave is free from his master"; *i.e.*, Sheol is place of utter inactivity, where law is unnecessary, since there "the wicked cease from troubling, and the weary are at rest." A problem is raised by the double occurrence of the identical phrase in Ugaritic, *urđ bḥpḥt* 'rš, in the poem of Alein Baal, *Syria*, 1932, 113 ff., viii, 7 f., and that of the Death of Baal, *ib.*, 1934, 305 ff., v, 14 f. The mng. of this in the context is obscure; it is to be translated, "go down (impv.) into the house of ḥ. earthwards." Albr., with varying etymology, would render the phrase with 'subterranean house,' or the like, as suitable to the context (*JPOS* 1934, 131, n. 162). But the above cited ref. permit the Ugaritic term to be explained from the Heb.; *cf.* the Jewish and Christian expressions of 'peace,' 'rest,' 'release,' for the departed.—[עם] הארץ: Grr. have exc. v, although \mathfrak{S}^H asterisks.—8. '38th year': N *al.*, '28th,' *vs.* A \mathfrak{S}^H \mathfrak{G} .—וכוריהו:

A N+most MSS Αζαριαν (not Α).—9. מַחֲמָאוֹת: again the variant מַחֲמָאוֹת in MSS; Hex. MSS, N+, ⚡^H as though 'מַחֲמָאוֹת': cf. v. 18.—10. וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוּ וַיִּשְׁתַּחֲוּ: ⚡ Hex. as pl.—קָבַל עִם: some MSS as one word; ⚡ (B) Κεβλααμ; ⚡^L εν Ιεβλααμ, contained as doublet in Hex.; Hex., 'before the people'=the other VSS. ⚡ supports the early error in ⚡, to be corrected after ⚡^L to קָבַל עִם; this suggestion originally made by Graetz, *Gesch.*, 2, 1, 99.—12. הוּא: ⚡ om.—13. שְׁלוֹם: on the name as 'replacement' see GB, Noth, *IP* 174.—בֶּן יִישׁוּ: prob. clan-name; cf. the city-name, Jud. 21^{8f}, and see Noth, *ib.*, 244.—14. מַנְחֵם='comforter,' as replacement of an earlier dead child (Noth, *ib.*, 222, listing Gr. parallels); for native and Akk. occurrences of the name see GB, and *IAE* 123; there is to be added the name Μαννεμος, found at Dura-Europos (Albr., *JAOS* 57 [1937], 319).—גִּידִי: the name also Phoen. (Harris, *Gram.*, 93); Šanda sugg. abbreviation, as from 'God is my luck.'—[ש] תְּרִיזָה: Gr. texts in corrupt form, exc. ⚡^L.—בְּשִׁמְרוֹן: ⚡^L om.—וַיִּשְׁלַךְ תְּהַתִּיּוֹ: ⚡ om.—16. תִּשְׁכַּח: ⚡ by early confusion with foll. *n. loci*, Θερσα, Θερσιδα, etc.; ⚡^L Ταφωε, etc.: Jos., Θαψαν=⚡; ⚡^H ⚡ Α=⚡; read תִּשְׁכַּח, with Then., *al.*—פָּתַח: Grr., "they opened (⚡^L sing.) to him"=other VSS (and so EVV), exc. ⚡ with sing. verb; the pl. is expected, but the sing. may be impersonal.—[ה] הִרְוִיתָהּ: read אֵת כֹּל [וּיָרִיךְ] אֵת כֹּל [הִרְוִיתָהּ] with all VSS, exc. ⚡ paraphrasing with foll. sentence, and most Grr. omitting 'all.'—הִרְוִיתָהּ: the first 'ה' is an early duplication, cf. a case in 7¹³; or, as Šanda sugg., a misplaced correction to read אֵת above.—18. מַחֲמָאוֹת: in place of the unusual prep. 3 MSS מַחֲמָאוֹת, 8 MSS מַחֲמָאוֹת, the latter=Grr. (exc. ⚡^L); ⚡ ⚡ have sing. noun; read מַחֲמָאוֹת; cf. 13¹¹, 14²⁴.—18. 19. יִשְׂרָאֵל כֹּל יָמָיו: read יִשְׂרָאֵל with Grr. ⚡^H, and so Böttcher, Then., *al.*—19. פוּל: Gr. x v have correctly Φουλ.—יָדוּ: Grr., ⚡^H=יָדוּ, to be accepted; cf. foll. בִּירוֹ. בִּירוֹ: ⚡ om.; St. elides as superfluous; rather, ⚡ so thought, or omission was due to parablepsis.—20. וַיִּצְוָה: Klost., *al.*, with Burn.'s judgment as 'probably correct,' read וַיִּצְוָה, 'and ordered,' with omission of foll. הִבְרָה; but Haupt rightly *cf.* LHeb. use of the verb='to collect,' the similar use of נָקַח in Jewish Aram. and of Arabic *hāraja*, e.g., *harāj*, 'tax,' cf. Engl. 'excise.'—כִּסְפָה: ⚡ om. (⚡^H ✕), regarding it as redundant, and so St.—22. פִּקְחִיהּ: MS 144 פִּקְחִיהּ; here and below B *al.* by early error φακεσιαν. The name as פִּקְחִיהּ appears on a Pal. seal, *IAE* 202.—23. שְׁנַרְיָם: cf. v. 27=B *al.*, ⚡^H ⚡ Α; other Grr. have revised: A *al.*, '10,' N c₂ *al.*, '12.'—25. רַמְיִיהּ: the name poss. occurs in a Pal. seal, *IAE* 178; cf. Safaitic names, רַמְלַת, רַמְלַת, *NPS* 1, 200.—בִּארְטוֹן בֵּית טַלְךָ: on the first noun see Note, I. 16¹⁸; for original בֵּית טַלְךָ, corrected by Kr. to 'הַבְּתָר', see Note, I. 15¹⁸. For 'בֵּית' Grr., εναρτιον=⚡^H, misreading as אֵת as קָר. with correction of texts [7 MSS 'הַבְּתָר'] וְאֵת הָאֵרִיָּה.—(see Rahlfs, *Sept.*), μετα του Αργουβ κ.μ.τ. Αρεια; ⚡^L (Lagarde) μετα αυτου Α.κ.μ.α.Α.; ⚡ awkwardly understands אֵת as accusative;

𐤃 'iuxta Argob et iuxta Ari,' *i.e.*, geographical terms, and so Rashi, 'near Argob,' and explaining the following with 'by the golden lion that stood in the palace.' St.'s suggestion, generally adopted since, is well to the point, that the passage is gloss to v.²⁹, and to be corrected to ואת החרת יאיר ואת א' ואת א', 'Argob and Havvoth-Jair,' for which Transjordanic localities see I. 4¹³.—[בנין] גלעדים: unless the pl. is geographical (*cf.* [גלעדים]), read either ה' (so MS 30), or גלעד, with St. Ⓞ for the whole phrase, απο τ. τετρακοσιων (=A Ⓢ^H, not N Ⓢ), which is incomprehensible.—27. '20 years': Grr. MSS change to '18,' c₂ to '30.'—29. ת' גלעד: also ת' גלעד, 16⁷, *q.v.*; there is now to be added the more exact transcription תבלהפלעד in Lidzb., *Altaram. Urkunden aus Assur* (1921).—הגלילה: the acc. of direction, coming to be used absolutely; the same form in Eze. 47⁸; *cf.* יהנה, Josh. 21³⁶.—30. הושע: the name in Elephantine texts, on Pal. jars (*IAE* 121, 204), and the full form הושעיהו in the Lachish letters.—עיה: B Ἰωαθαμ, Ἀχας; in v.³² Ἰωαθαν, Ἀζαριου; similar variations in other MSS, *e.g.*, A Ⓢ^H; Ⓢ=𐤃 throughout. Ⓞ^L om. this date datum.—33. ירושא: MSS ירושה=Ch.—34. עשה 2⁰: 5 MSS Ken., deR. om.; but the verb as at 14³, where no correction (in line with v.³ above) is registered.—35. כרו: VSS, exc. Ⓞ, as though הכר.—36. [עשה]: Mich., Ken., וכל אשר=VSS; see deR. and Bär, and Note, I. 16²⁷.—37. להעלית: the Hif. always used of plagues, *e.g.*, Ex. 8¹⁷, Am. 8¹¹.—ביתור: B A *al.* om. רצון: רצון is demanded by Akk. *Rašunu*, and so Gr. Παασων (exc. j Παασση), *cf.* Ⓢ^H *Rāšān*=Ⓢ Ⓢ.—38. ויקבר עש: 12 MSS Ken., deR. om. by parablepsis, and so A N (not Ⓢ); Ⓢ^H ✕; MS 96, Ⓞ^L om. עש אבתו. 3 MSS, Ⓞ^L Ⓢ Ⓢ Ⓢ om.—an unnecessary addition.

Ch. 16. The reign of Ahaz of Judah. || 2 Ch. 28; *cf.* *Ant.*, ix, 12. For the complication of original elements in this ch. see Wellh., *Comp.*, asserting that it is impossible to distinguish them; see *SBOT* for such an essay. 1. The king's name always thus appears abbreviated, and so now on a seal of one of his officers, of 'Ushna, minister of Ahaz,' published by Torrey; see Note. But an Akk. text (see below) gives the full form of the name, Yauḫazi, *i.e.*, Jehoahaz, also name of the Israelite king, 13¹. The mother's name is exceptionally ignored. 3b. *And also his son he made to pass through the fire*: this was a holocaust, not a symbolic rite, and so Josephus precisifies, ἴδιον ὠλοκαύτωσε παῖδα. Such fire-immolation was symptomatic of the general breakdown of the religion of the small states of the day under the pressure of Assyria; the record is repeated for Manasseh (21⁶), and the cult is later noted as general (23¹⁰, where the sacrifice is made 'to Molek');

the sacrifice of the 'first-born' is condemned by the contemporary prophet Micah (6⁷), *cf.* Jer 7³¹. For the Molech cult see Comm. on I. 11, n. 2. The datum suggests some extraordinary occasion, like the similar immolation practised by the Moabite king (3²⁷); Šanda thinks of the emergency recorded immediately below. However, this may be a general indictment without definite background. V.⁴ is distinctly Jeremianic in language (*cf.* Jer. 2²⁰, 3⁶), a criticism that casts doubt upon v.³.

VV.⁵⁻⁶. Two archival notes. 5. *Then came up Resin [𐤒] Resin—cf. 15³⁷] king of Aram and Pekah ben Remaliah king of Israel to Jerusalem to war, and they besieged Ahaz, and they were not able to war [so 𐤒].* The v. is practically identical with Is. 7¹: "And it was in the days of Ahaz ben Jotham ben Uzziah king of Judah, there came up Resin king of Aram and Pekah ben Remaliah king of Israel to Jerusalem for war against it, and he [*sic*] was not able to war against it." Both texts are slightly corrupt, and are examples of ease of corruption in even simple compositions; see Note for suggested corrections. The historical introduction to the prophecy in Is. 7 depends upon our narrative.¹ That ch. is a full commentary upon the present brief item, picturing the terror caused by the bold invasion, giving as motive of the invaders the purpose of installing a new dynasty in Jerusalem in the person of an Aramæan, Ben-Tab'el, as also the recalcitrancy of Ahaz, who nevertheless was relieved of the immediate peril. The relief came through the sought-for intervention of the Assyrian king, as the foll. vv. narrate. Politically the prophet's advice was far-sighted, for instead of entering into international coalitions Judah's safety lay in having faith

¹ See Gray, *Isaiah*, on 7¹, as against earlier views, *e.g.*, of Dillmann. The latter position has been resumed by E. G. Kraeling, 'The Immanuel Prophecy,' *JBL* 50 (1931), 277 ff., see *per contra*, Budde, 'Das Immanuelzeichen,' *JBL* 52 (1933), 22 ff. Our v., like the following one, is of archival origin; note its terseness. And the religious disinterestedness of the historian throughout the ch. argues against citation from the prophet. For discussion of Isaiah's part in this crisis see Kraeling, *op. cit.*, W. C. Graham, *AJSL* 50 (1934), 201 ff., and for Hosea's relation to it S. Spiegel, *HTR* 1934, 116 ff.; for the dating see M. Thilo, *In welchem Jahre geschah die sogenannte syrisch-efraemitische Invasion?* etc. (1918).

in its God (Is. 7⁹). Assyria was a far more overwhelming foe than the trumpety states of Syria-Palestine. **6.** *At that time 'the king of Edom' [𐤀 Resin king of Aram] restored Elath to Edom [𐤀 Aram], and drove out the Jews from Elath [𐤀 with variant of the later pronunciation, Eloth]; and Edomites [EVV, exc. JV, the Syrians] came to Elath, and they dwelt there unto this day.* The similars אֶדוֹם, 'Edom,' and אֶרָם, 'Aram' have been early confused as elsewhere (*e.g.*, in I. 11), in the text-tradition, and peculiarly so here in Heb. MSS and edd. The correction of *Aram* 1^o is generally accepted, and with it the excision of *Resin*, as there was no original control of Elath, so that it might be 'restored to Aram.' Edom took advantage of the turmoil in the north to recover the Red Sea port and cast off the dominance of Judah, as since Amaziah's day (14^{7. 22}). The final *unto this day* expresses the actual later status down into Nabataean times; see the archæological studies by Glueck. *Jews*: here is the first application of that word to Judæan citizens; Israel had passed as a political entity.

VV. 7-9. Ahaz's appeal to Tiglath-pileser for help, and the latter's final conquest of Damascus. The passage connects with the two preceding archival notes, and serves as introduction to the following more intimate history. **7.** Ahaz's letter is couched in current diplomatic language: *I am thy servant [literally slave] and thy son.* The diplomatic term 'thy servant' appears constantly in the Amarna letters, *e.g.*, in those of Abd-ḥipa of Jerusalem; *cf.* the contemporary parallel in Bar-Rkb's inscription, "I am B.-R., servant of Tiglath-pileser." 'Thy son' is paralleled by the language of Ishtar-duri king of Armenia, who "as a son sends (messengers recognizing) authority to his father," *i.e.*, Ashurbanipal (*KB* 2, 230; *ARA* 2, §834). **8.** Ahaz accompanies the letter with a *present*, a word that is also used for *bribe*. **9.** *And the king of Assyria listened to him, and the king of Assyria came up to Damascus, and captured it, and took it in exile [𐤀+to Kir], and Rason [𐤀 Resin] he killed.* Of this notable triumph, of date 732 B.C., we have from Assyrian sources only the annual notes in the Eponym List: "Ashur-daninani of the city of Mazamua (eponym, 733 B.C.): Against the land of Damascus. Nabû-bêl-uṣur of the city of Sime

(732): against the land of Damascus." For the year 734 a campaign 'against Philistia' is registered. Contemporaneously Tiglath-pileser records the tribute of 'Yauḥazi of Yaudi' (the first mention of Judah in the Akk. inscriptions), along with that of some twenty states, ranging from Kue and Sam'al in North Syria to Moab, Edom, and Philistia (CP 322; ARA I, §801; ATB I, 348; AB 463 f.). Ahaz's diplomatic part in the history is of interest. This was the end of Aram-Damascus as a power. The Heb. *to Kir* is lacking in 6. The place is otherwise referred to as an eastern land in association with Elam and Shoa in the assault on the holy city in the oracle of the Valley of Vision, Is. 22⁵⁻⁶. In Amos is given the prophecy that "the people of Aram shall go in exile to Kir," from which region ὙΝΗΗ had "brought up Aram" (9⁷). It is generally accepted that the word here is a gloss from Amos to point the fulfilment of that prophecy; see Comm. on Amos and Isaiah, especially Gray on the latter.

VV.¹⁰⁻¹⁸. Ahaz's attendance upon Tiglath-pileser at his triumph in Damascus, with resultant ritual innovations in the temple, and certain reconstructions, after Assyrian mode. **10a.** *And king Ahaz went to meet Tiglath-pileser king of Assyria, to Damascus.* The occasion, 732 B.C., has its brilliant sidelight from the contemporary Zenjirli inscription, according to which Panammūwa, the father of the inscriber Bar-Rkb, died 'in the camp of Tiglath-pileser,' where he had "run at the wheel of his lord T.-p.," evidently at Damascus, for it was from this city, as the inscription proceeds, that the body was transported home to Sam'al-Ya'di. Ahaz then may well have met the far-northern king and the crown prince. The same politics united northern Ya'di and southern Judah against their overweening neighbour Damascus, but to the undoing of all the Syro-Palestinian states in the Assyrian conquest. **10b.** *And he saw the altar that was at Damascus; and king Ahaz sent to the priest Uriah the fashion of the altar and the pattern of it:* so for the accusative phrase the EVV—as an architect would say, sketch and plans. The real object of the story is the account of this innovation. Uriah is the priest who was 'taken for record' on Isaiah's tablet (Is. 8²). Notable is the continued objective, non-moralizing narrative of the

exotic innovation; the grandeur of the new altar made greater popular impression than its contradiction to the native cult. It is generally accepted that the altar was of Assyrian, not Damascene style: as Olmstead says (*HPS* 452): "As in all newly organised provinces, the cult of Ashur and the king had been established in Damascus, and the vassal rulers were ordered to follow this example." Such is the opinion also of Gressmann (*ZAW* 1924, 324), and of Kittel and Robinson in their Histories; otherwise Šanda, who thinks of a Syrian altar. V.¹¹. The priest carried out the royal orders against the return of the king. VV.^{12, 13}. The royal sacrifices detailed present the act of consecration, as at Solomon's dedication of his temple; for a royal ritual *cf.* that 'of the prince' in Eze. 46. **14.** *And the bronze altar that was before YHWH he removed from the front of the house, between the altar and the house of YHWH, and put it at the side of the altar to the north, The altar is 'the great altar' (v.¹⁵) of stone, standing on the rock; cf. I. 8^{22, 54}. The old bronze altar is identical with 'the bronze altar before YHWH,' referred to *en passant* at I. 8⁶⁴. See Comm. on those passages, and *cf.* W. R. Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, Note L; Nowack, *Arch.*, 2, 41 ff.; Kittel, *Studien*, 50 ff.; and *GVI* 2, 364. The present note supports I. 8⁶⁴, the historicity of which Smith denied because of the bronze construction of the altar, which strangely enough is omitted in the list of Hiram's works, I. 7^{13ff.}. For the material of the new altar Šanda thinks of stone; but the specifications as given for a work of art and the replacement of the old metal altar imply similar construction for the new one. Such an altar of bronze with alleged dimensions is described in 2 Ch. 4¹. For like pride in a new 'altar of bronze' (the same words as here) *cf.* Byblian King Yehaumilk's inscription. **15a.** Details of the king's orders to the priest for the ritual *on the great altar, i.e., the new altar*, are recorded, with the specifications logically arranged: (1) *burn the morning holocaust and the evening oblation (i.e., the primitive general sacrifices)*; (2) *and the king's holocaust and his oblation*; (3) *and the holocaust of all the people of the land (the nationalistic term) and their oblations and libations*; (4) *and all blood of holocaust and all blood of sacrifice thou shalt sprinkle upon it*. The oblation (*minhāh*, AV *meat offering*, in Old English language,*

RVV JV *meal-offering*) by early usage included animal sacrifice, as at I. 18²⁹; indeed part of the actual meal-offering was to be ritually burnt according to the Law, Lev. 6⁷⁻⁸; see at length Nowack, *Arch.*, 2, 221, n. 1. These directions are evidently written orders, which have been so far preserved, and they give a succinct contemporary description of ritual.

15b. *And the bronze altar shall be for me to inquire at.* The meaning of the infinitive has long been disputed: JV . . . *to look to*; German comm. have generally followed GV, "Ich will denken was ich mache," and the like; but such irresolution is quite out of place. AV followed Calvin, 'ad oracula sciscitanda,' 'for procuring oracles,' cf. FV 'afin d'y consulter le Seigneur,' and W. R. Smith has supported this interpretation (*Religion of the Semites*, Note L), followed by Burney, Haupt in *SBOT*; cf. further Mowinckel, *Psalmen-Studien*, 1, 146, who holds that the primary meaning of the verb (*bikkēr*) is the examination of the sacrifice for omens. With this most plausible interpretation we have a case of the intrusion of the vast Babylonian system of omen-sacrifices, which the Law abominated; cf. Eze. 21²⁶, how "the king of Babylon looked in the liver," and see at length Jastrow, *Die Religion Babyloniens und Assyriens*, cc. 19, 20. The old bronze altar was now to be the royal perquisite; its antiquity possessed potency.

17. The removal for smelting of the wheeled bases (I. 7^{27ff.}) and of the oxen underneath the bronze sea (*ib.*, vv. 23^{ff.}). There are grammatical confusions in **ℋ**, evidence of early corruption of text. With slight rectifications there may be obtained with Stade, followed by Šanda: *And king Ahaz cut up [ℋ+the borders] the bases, and removed from them [ℋ+and] the laver [the pl. is expected], and the sea he took down from the bronze oxen that were under it, and placed it upon plaster-work of stones.* The verb 'to cut up' is used similarly at 18¹⁶, 24¹³. The *borders*, or *frame-pieces*, were only an accessory to the laver apparatus; the whole bronze carriage must have been removed for smelting. The intrusion of the word may have been due to avoid contradiction with 25¹³, according to which the bases were still in existence. The brass was probably used for the tribute to Assyria; cf. the tradition of the fate of all such vessels upon the destruction of the city. **18.** The v. lists some building-operations, concluding with the obscure

phrase (separated in \mathfrak{H} by the verse-cæsure), literally, *from the presence of the king of Assyria*, or, as the prepositional phrase may mean, *because of the k. of Ass.* (cf. variations in ancient and modern VSS). Šanda's suggestion alone throws light, viz., to attach the phrase with the latter meaning to v.¹⁷, at least as a gloss, explanatory of the removal of the brass as for the tribute to Assyria. The remainder of the v. is like v.¹⁷ with its inner-Hebrew difficulties and variety of interpretations; it deals with reconstruction of buildings unknown to us, but so well known to the contemporary recorder that he could use categorical terms. The v. as revised (see Note further) reads: *And the covered-way (?—cf. EVV) of the Sabbath that he built [with Grr.; \mathfrak{H} they built, EVV they had built] in the house (i.e., the temple), and the King's Entry outwards he turned about in/to [?] the house of YHWH.* Such details belong to a simple building-record.

VV.^{19. 20}. The final data of the reign. The repeated 'with his fathers,' absent in OGrr., is secondary.

1. '17th': Gr. c₂, '18th' = \mathfrak{S} א.—א: this name found on a Samarian ostrakon and on a seal, *IAE* 212. The seal of Ušna, minister of Ahaz, noted above, was published by Torrey in *BASOR* 79 (1940), with additional note by Albr. on אשנא as = 'give now,' with vocative of deity omitted, and the root as in 'Joash,' 'Josiah' (see Note, 12¹, also further discussion by these scholars and E. L. Sukenik, *ib.*, nos. 82, 84).—2. אלהיו: B A \mathfrak{G}^L $\theta\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\ \pi\iota\sigma\tau\omega\varsigma$, *al.*, $\tau.$ $\theta\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \pi\iota\sigma\tau\omega\varsigma$; origin of the last word?—3. מלכי: early error as in B, $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ for $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\omega\varsigma$, induced the plus in the other Grr. (exc. \mathfrak{G}^L) and \mathfrak{S}^H , 'Jeroboam son of Nebat.'—בניו: Ch., בניו = \mathfrak{G}^L here.—5. Cf. Is. 7¹.—ויצרו על אהו: Is., למנהטת עליה; St. reduces to עליה; BH sugg. ויצרו עליה.—יבלו: correct, as *vs.* יבל of Is.—להלהב: read with Is. + עליה.—6. רצין מלך ארם: read with Klost. and critics since, מלך ארם; with the error the royal name was interpolated from the preceding v.—לארם: read לארם, as suggested by early critics, Clericus, Mich., *al.*, and now generally accepted (not by Šanda).—אדמים: so BH (MS L, many MSS), and so K_r. for Kt. ארמים (Bār), ארמים (Mich., Ken, Ginsb.); see deR. For 'Edomites' testify the Grr., \mathfrak{S}^H \mathfrak{T}^L \mathfrak{P} , for 'Aramæans' \mathfrak{T}^W \mathfrak{S} א. ארמים is case of insertion of vowel-letter to enforce the K_r.—אילות[ע]: read אילת; the variation is unique to \mathfrak{H} .—7. פלטר: a variation in spelling, and as in the Panammūwa inscr., *vs.* פלטר (so MSS [here] above and v.¹⁹).—הקונים: a unique K_r. for הקונים, and so 16 MSS Kt.—8. הנמצא: 4 MSS Ken., deR. + באצרות, and so Gr. MSS, \mathfrak{S}^H ; also Gr. MSS ignore בא below; Lucianic x = \mathfrak{H} .—אשר: B *al.* om., \mathfrak{S}^H ✕.—9. אל ורמשק: אל על is

expected (so 1 MS) in this military phrase.—ויגלה קירה: G^{κ} $\alpha\pi\omega\kappa\iota\sigma\epsilon\nu$ αυτην; G^{ι} $\kappa. \alpha\pi\omega\kappa. \tau. \pi\omicron\lambda\iota\upsilon$, i.e., 'ק' as 'city'; Hex. introduced the name as a plus to G , S^{H} stating it as a plus from Aq., Κυρηνηνδεδε; *Onom. Gr.*, Κυρηνη, *Onom. Lat.*, 'Cyrene'= V 'Cyrenen'; T לקרינא—i.e., as *n. loci*. St.'s deletion of the word has been generally accepted; see Comm.—10. לקראת ת' פ': B† $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ απαντην αυτου τω θ., from which St. argues for original לקראתו; but such repetition is common in this diction.—דומשק= T ; the unique spelling is prob. corruption of Aramaizing דומשק in Ch.= S here. MSS have correctly דומשק, or give the proper K^{r} . to H ; see Ginsb. *ad loc.* It has been well suggested that the word, which is not properly articulated, is a gloss to 'ד' below. For the variations in spelling (e.g., Amarna *Dumaška*) see Lexx., Dussaud, *TH* 202, and the extensive discussion by Rosenthal, *Die aram. Forschung*, 16 ff.—אוריה: name of a Hittite, 2 Sam. 11³⁰, for Hittite origin of which see Montg., *JAOS* 55 (1935), 94.—דמות: G^{H} $\tau\omicron$ ομοιωμα, to which G^{ι} pref. $\tau\omicron$ μετρον αυτου, on basis of which doublet Klost., St., Šanda (*cf. BH*) would read קרות, 'measurements,' but the foll. word תבנית is prob. the technical word for this, as in Ex. 25⁹, where the term includes the dimensions of tabernacle and furniture.—11. מרמשק: by parablepsis G lacks what follows through 'מר, v. 12 (S^{H} ✕); similarly in v. 12 G (S ✕) has like omission with the repeated המובה; G^{ι} H ; see Rahlfs, *SS* 3, 245.—13. ויטך את נבנו: G ignored the verb.—14. המובה הנהח: an attempt of K^{r} . to obtain the construct construction; read the first noun as absolute; for such apposition of thing and material see GK §131, d, and for Arabic, Wright, *Arab. Gr.*, 2, §94; *cf.* the parallel constructions in the Yeha milk inscr., המובה נחשת, etc.; the same construction as here below in v. 17; St.'s objection on the score of grammar is not valid, while precision of the altar is required as against his elision of the second word.—מאת פני הבית: B A v have by error $\tau\omicron$ προσωπον, other MSS $\alpha\pi\omicron/\pi\rho\omicron$ προσωπον.—"מבין המובה ומבין בית י": the statement gives precision of location; there is no reason for elision after St.'s suggestion.—המובה צפונה: G^{ι} "the altar which he made to the north."—15. ויצינה: K^{r} . =VSS, and is the expected rdg.; Klost., *BH*, *al.* retain Kt., and elide the foll. nominal object; but for such repetition of names and titles *cf.* v. 16.—[בל עב] הארץ 1 MS om.; of Grr. only A y have, S^{H} ✕; but the political term is to be kept, *vs.* Klost., St., *al.*; see Comm., on 11¹⁷⁻¹⁸.—לְבָרַךְ: Grr., $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ $\tau\omicron$ $\pi\rho\omega\iota$ =לְבָרַךְ= S^{H} ; S א 'for praying'; V 'ad voluntatem me'; T alone correctly with the same verb; *cf.* renderings of Kamph., Klost., Kit.; Ehrl., 'den Unterschied zu zeigen,' for popular comparison of the two altars (!)—16. צוה: most Grr., S^{H} as צוהו, which St., *BH* prefer.—המלך: G om., S^{H} ✕.—17. אהו: B C X om.—המטורה המבנות: the impossible apposition proves the secondary character of the first word.—מעליהם: מעליהן is desiderated.—[הביר]: ואת, and so

properly Kr. , and VSS, exc. V , which however makes the prec. verb govern the two preceding nouns.—תַּתְּחִיָּה : the gender assimilated to הַהֲשֵׁת.—18. מִיִּכָּן הַשֶּׁבֶת : for the first word 9 MSS מִיִּכָּן ; Kr. מִיִּכָּן ; Grr., το θεμελιον της καθεδρας, i.e., rdg. as מִיִּכָּן הַשֶּׁבֶת, and so G^L , with the plus τ. σαββατων ; T זִבְחָא [τρείχος=] מִיִּכָּן ; S 'house of the Sabbath' ; I 'mesech sabbatorum' ; V 'musach sabbati.' Rashi interprets as of 'a roof made for shade to sit under on the Sabbath-day,' Kimchi as of 'a structure for the Sabbath-guard to take shelter under' ; see Grotius further. Ch.'s rdg., " מִיִּכָּן דְּלִתּוֹת בַּיִת " represents a free interpretation of the first noun as though from מִיִּכָּן.—בָּנִי (= T) ; Grr., 'he built' = S^H (with note of the same rdg. in Theod., Sym.), and V ; S 'which was built' ; the pl. might be collective and pluperfect.—בְּבֵית : VSS+ 'of the Lord,' explicatively.—הַרְצִינָה : acc. of direction, 'that outwards' ; some critics, e.g., *BH* would correct to the simple adj.—הִנָּבֵן (= Grr., T) ; S 'joined' ; V 'convertit.'—בֵּית : G (B = S^H) οἰκω Κυριου ; al. Grr. with prep. 'in,' and similarly T 'into,' S 'with'.—19. אִשָּׁר : 18 MSS pref. וְכֵן = G^L T^L S A .—20. עָם אֲחֵרֵי : 20 ; 1 MS and Grr., exc. A 123, om. the unnecessary repetition. Note Ch.'s blunt denial : " and they brought him not into the sepulchre of the kings of Israel," which is repeated here by Gr. g (Ιουδα for 'Israel').

Ch. 17. The reign of Hoshea of Israel, the fall of the Northern Kingdom, with exile of the people and importation of foreign colonists with the institution of their cults. Cf. *Ant.*, ix, 14 ; a brief cross-reference to the deportation in 1 Ch. 5²⁶.¹

VV.^{1.2} Extent of the reign and the moral judgment upon it. 2. *And he did the evil in the eyes of YHWH, only not like the kings of Israel before him.* *Per contra*, there is the perversion of Lucian, 'beyond all the kings of Israel who were before him' (= I), repeating the judgment on Ahab (I. 16³³). Indeed his and Israel's fate might well have produced judgment like that on Jeroboam I's house (I. 14^{10ff.}). Some contemporary evidence may be contained in the brief remark ;

¹ For this period are to be consulted the Histories of Stade, 1, 575 ff. ; Rogers, 2, 301 ff. ; Hall, 461 ff. ; Olmstead, *HA* ch. 17, and his *Western Asia in the Days of Sargon* (1908) ; S. Smith, *CAH* 3, ch. 2, pt. 2 ; Sellin, 1, 232 ff. ; Kittel, 2, 364 ff. ; Robinson, ch. 18 ; Meyer, 3, 26 ff. ; also literature cited in int. to ch. 15 ; for the Egyptian history Petrie, 3, 280 ff. ; Alt, *Israel u. Aegypten*, 56 ff. ; Breasted, ch. 26. For the Ass. texts of Sargon's reign bearing upon the Biblical history see *KB* 2, 34 ff., *ATLAO* 522 f., *CP* 323 ff., *AB* 466 ff., *AKAT* 174 ff., *ARA* 2, 1 ff., *ATB* 1, 348 ff. ; particular citations are given in place below. For the bearings of the history on the Samaritan sect see the writer's volume, ch. 4.

as Stade says (*Akad. Reden*, p. 208): "The pre-Exilic editor of Kings must accordingly have read in the sources at hand notices of Hosea that presented him in a more favourable light than his predecessors." Or is it a sympathetic expression for this last and valiant king? A Jewish tradition appears in Rashi and Kimchi to the effect that Hoshea removed the guards set on the road to Jerusalem to keep Israelites from going thither to worship.

VV.³⁻⁶. Cf. the almost identical parallel in 18⁹⁻¹². In as many verses are contained four archival items, mosaic patches in a complicated history. Tiglath-pileser was succeeded by his son Shalmaneser V (727-722 B.C.), but the father's triumph was undone in troubles at home and abroad; only one of his son's inscriptions survives (*ARA* 1, p. 297). 3. Hoshea, once pro-Assyrian (see on 15³⁰) took part in the rebellious coalition (Heb., *conspiracy*) of the western provinces, and so the new Assyrian monarch *campaign*ed [Heb., *went up*] *against him, and Hoshea became his vassal* [Heb., *slave*], *and rendered him tribute*. 4a. *But withal the king of Assyria found conspiracy in Hoshea; for he had sent envoys to So king of Egypt, and brought not up tribute to the king of Assyria, as he had done year by year*. These shifting alliances of the day, now with Assyria, now with Egypt, are illustrated in the prophet Hoshea's scornful references (5¹³, 7^{8. 11. 16}, 8⁹, 11⁵, 12², 14⁴). Egypt herself was in confused enough condition with contest between the native dynasty and the upstart Ethiopian line, which triumphed in 712 B.C. But she took advantage of Shalmaneser's own troubles to reassert herself at least by intrigue in her ancient Asiatic sphere of interest. So, king of Misraim, was an important element in Winckler's notion of an expanded Arabian kingdom of Muşur/Muşran in the NW of Arabia (see *KAT* 146), and with him Şanda and Robinson are inclined to agree.² But the Heb. consonants of the name, read by Ẕr. as 'So' are to be vocalized as Sewe, and the name to be identified with 'Sib'e the tartan' (the title in 18¹⁷) of Egypt, allied with Hanno, king of Gaza, in the great revolt against Assyria; his name now appears in Sargon's Annals

² For Old-Arabic reff. see Montg., *Arabia and the Bible*, 133 ff., and for occurrence of *Mşrn*, Conti Rossini, *Chrest.*, 180, Ryckmans, *NPS* 1, 348.

for his second year (*CP* 327; *ARA* 2, §5), with parallel reference in the Display Inscription (*KB* 2, 55; *CP* 331; *ARA* 2, §55). His rank as an Egyptian commander only, not king (as he appears in one of the texts), is proved by his exact title as tartan and the association of his name with 'the tribute of Pir'u (Pharaoh) king of Egypt'; and such is the judgment of Alt, *Israel u. Aegypten*, 56 ff., Kittel, Meyer. **4b.** *And the king of Assyria put him under arrest, and shut him up in prison.* The first verb is used of Jeremiah's formal arrest (Jer. 33¹, 36⁵). But the capital city maintained itself by reason of civil war in Assyria. **5.** *And the king of Assyria campaigned in all the land, and he went up to Samaria, and besieged it for three years.* **6a.** *In the ninth year of Hoshea (still de jure king) the king of Assyria took Samaria.* For the three years as approved by the Assyrian records see Meyer, *GA* 3, 29. Assyriology has determined how the prolonged siege was terminated. The city was taken by Shalmaneser's successor, Sargon II, who is generally regarded as an usurper.³ Sargon records in the Annals of his first year (722/721) as follows: "Samaria (Samerinai) I besieged and took . . . (three lines lost). 27,290 inhabitants I carried away, 50 chariots I collected there as a royal force . . . (The city) I set up again and made more populous than before. People from lands which I had taken I settled there. My men I set over them as governors. Tribute and taxes as upon the Assyrians I set upon them."⁴ It is noticeable that the Biblical record ignores the name of Sargon, who appears only once elsewhere (Is. 20¹). The credit is given by our recorder anonymously to 'the king of Assyria,' whether through ignorance or carelessness is not clear; according to the duplicate in 18¹⁰, "they took it." The '27,290 inhabitants' (*n.b.* the exact Assyrian census) is a modest figure, when compared with the 60,000 landed gentry of 15¹⁹.²⁰ for which see Comm. The deportation is expanded

³ So Olmstead, *HA* 206 f.; Meyer, p. 30. An inscription published by E. Unger (*FuF* 9 [1933], 245 f.; cf. *AfO* 9 [1934], 79) claims that he was a son of Tiglath-pileser.

⁴ So following Rogers on the whole, *CP* 326; cf. *ATB* 1, 348, *ARA* 2, §4, *AB* 466. A parallel appears in the Display Inscription, *KB* 2, 55, *CP* 331, *ARA* 2, §55. The Harvard expedition at Samaria has revealed Sargon's reconstructions, but of rough work; see Reisner, *Excavations at Samaria*, 123 ff., Olmstead, *HPS* 460 f.

in v.¹⁸ to that of the removal of Israel at large, so that "only the tribe of Judah was left." As a political expression, denoting destruction of the kingdom and exile of its representative citizens, this statement might stand. The absolute Biblical statement would ignore the heretical Samaritans. There arose later the orthodox Jewish notion that all Judah was taken in exile by Babylon. For an attempt to precise the population of Israel and Judah at that period see Albright, *JPOS* 1925, 20 ff., and cf. H. G. May, in *BA* 1943, 57 ff., arguing that the Israelites deported could not have been, at the extreme, more than one-twentieth of the population. For the enforced colonization of the territory Sargon records for his seventh year his conquest of the lawless tribes of "Tamud, Ibadid, Marsimanu and Ḥaiapa, distant Arabs, who inhabit the desert," and his deporting the remainder of them and settling them in Samaria (*ARA* 2, §17; *ATB* 1, 349 f.). For another importation of colonists see below, vv.^{21ff.} 6b. *And he carried Israel to Assyria, and settled them in Halah and in Habor, [on] the river of Gozan, and the cities of Media.* Sargon's item of the number of exiles is complemented here with their destinations. Of the localities named Ḥabōr is the district of the Ḥabūr, the great tributary of the Euphrates in the ancient Aram-naharaim. Gozan is Akk. Guzana (Ptolemy's Gausanitis), now identified by von Oppenheim with the region of Tell Halaf; see his *Tell Halaf*, pp. 41, etc., and so earlier Forrer, *Die Provinzeinteilung*, 23 f., with Akk. references. Ḥalah is Akk. Ḥalahḫu, possibly Ptolemy's Chalchitis near Gausanitis. For these regions see *CIOT* 1, 267 f.; Winckler, *Alltest. Untersuchungen*, 108; and *KAT* 268, also Šanda at length. For the presence of Israelite colonists about Harran ca. 650 B.C., see S. Schiffer, *OLz.*, Beih. I (1907), 'Keilschriftliche Spuren . . . der deportierten Samarier.' For the cities, i.e., city-states, of Media Grr. read 'the mountains' (*hârê* for 'ârê). The region is that of the mountain chains to the east of the Tigris valley. The conquest of Media was one of Sargon's triumphs; see his Annals for year 8. According to the book of Tobit its hero was one of this deportation; he lived in Nineveh, but had compatriots in Media (I^{1f.} 10. 14). I Ch. 5²⁶ assigns the exile of Transjordanic Israel to Pul and Tiglath-pileser (!), and then repeats,

erroneously, our list. For a contemporary picture of such a deportation by the Assyrians see the Kirkuk document published by E. Chiera and E. A. Speiser in *JAOS* 47 (1927), 56 ff. (no. 20).

VV.⁷⁻²³. A homily upon the fall of Israel. **7.** *And it came to pass, because the Bnê-Israel sinned*, etc. The apodosis occurs in v.¹⁸, that *YHWH was very angry*, as recognized only by JV among EVV; the long period belongs to the Deuteronomistic rhetoric, cf. Jer. 16¹⁰⁻¹³, etc. **8.** *And they walked in the statutes of the nations that YHWH dispossessed from the Bnê-Israel, and the kings of Israel whom they made*: so for the last clause the ungrammatical Hebrew; trr. introduce the demanded prep. and read *of the kings of Israel*; the passage is secondary, introduced to cast the blame on the schismatic royalty of the North. See also long note in *SBOT*. The final verb has also given trouble; cf. EVV, *which they made/practised*, with antecedent in 'the statutes'; but the verb 'to make' in sense of appointment to office occurs at I. 12³¹, etc.; those kings were man-made, not of God. **9.** *And the children of Israel did secretly things that were not right against the LORD*: so EVV; JV . . . *did impute things that were not right unto the LORD*. But read for the verbal phrase, *uttered things . . . against YHWH*; cf. Is. 3⁸, and see Note on the unique Heb. verb. According to the v. every place was provided with its heathenish chapel, *high-places . . . from watchmen's tower to fortified city*, for which military phrase cf. 18⁸. **10.** *And they set up for themselves pillars and Asherah-poles upon every high hill and under every leafy tree*: the same language above, I. 14²³, and in Jer. 2²⁰, 3⁶, Dt. 12²⁻³. **13.** *YHWH testified against* [so AV; RVV *testified unto*; JV *forewarned*] *Israel and Judah by 'every prophet and'* [with correction of \mathfrak{H} with 3 Heb MSS and \mathfrak{C}] *every seer*. So for the verb, EVV following VSS; the same verb is so consistently translated, along with its cognate noun, *testimonies*, v.¹⁵, by EVV, including JV in the latter case. Kittel uses the verb and noun, 'to warn,' 'warning.' But Haupt on the basis of an Akk. etymology for the noun, common in the Law, as in 'the ark of the testimony,' translates the verb with 'enjoined (upon),' and the noun with 'injunction'; see Note further. The language is doubtless legal, denoting authoritative deposition

at law. Cf. the legal form in which Isaiah drew up his oracle on 'a tablet' with 'witnesses' (Is. 8^{1f.}). The addition of 'seer' to 'prophet' appears old-fashioned, but is not an intrusion, as with Stade, *al.*; cf. the contemporary reference to prophets and seers, Is. 30¹⁰. The words *and Judah* are probably a gloss suggested by v.¹⁹ (so Burney, Šanda). *According to all the law which I commanded your fathers, and which I sent to you by my servants the prophets*: as Šanda properly observes, *law (tôrāh)* is used here in pre-nomistic sense; it is mediated by prophets, and without reference to Moses; cf. Hos. 8¹².

14. *They hardened their neck like their father's neck*: cf. Dt. 10¹⁶, Jer. 7²⁶, etc., and the phrase 'stiff-necked people,' Ex. 32⁹, etc. (J and E). **15.** *They went after vanity, and became vain*: so EVV; JV . . . *after things of nought, and became nought*. The picturesque notion of the noun and its derivative verb is lost in these trr.; it is a puff of air that they followed, and so they became light as air. The phrase occurs in Jer. 2⁵, Stade, Šanda regard it as a loan, and probably with right. The plural of the noun occurs in I. 16^{13. 26}, and is directly identified with strange gods in the Song of Moses, Dt. 32²¹. This and the following v. resume the indictment of vv.^{8ff.}, with extension to the grosser breaches, idolatry, polytheism, exotic cults. **16.** *And they made for themselves molten-work, two calves, and they made an Asherah*. The first noun is collective, appearing above, I. 14⁹; 'two calves' is apparently an intrusion from the Jeroboam story, I. 12, and the same sentence may be passed upon the final sentence, which parallels the 'Asherah-poles' of v.¹⁰, and may have been suggested by 2I³ (so Stade, Šanda, not Kittel, Benzinger); the temptation to addition in the indictment is illustrated by the plus in G^L L in v.¹⁷, "and they made ephod and teraphim." *And they worshipped all the host of heaven, and they served the Baal*. There was similar intrusion of such astral worship from Assyria in Manasseh's reign; see 2I⁵, and Comm. on 23^{4ff.}. **17.** *And they caused their sons and daughters to pass through the fire*: for such holocausts, practised in Judah, see 16³. *And they practised divination and enchantment*: the first noun in the tr. refers primarily to divination by arrows, as, e.g., practised by the king of Babylon according to Eze. 2I^{26ff.} (EVV 2I^{21ff.}), the second to charm practice (see Note).

The same pair of magical operations is derided in an ancient Balaam ode, Num. 23²³. For them see Dhorme, *L'Évolution religieuse d'Israël*, I, 227 ff. As is the case with such language the terms became general in significance, the first of the above being used of necromancy in 1 Sam. 28⁸. For the official adoption of all such strange cults see the history of Manasseh's reign, 21^{3ff.} **18.** As observed above, on v.⁷, this v. gives the apodosis of the long indictment; what follows is literarily distinct, in part paralleling the preceding homily. **19.** Judah is condemned, a supererogatory judgment. **20.** The v. reverts to the earlier exposition with *all the seed of Israel*; this can hardly include Judah, as with most comm. The phrase, *he delivered them into the hand of spoilers*, repeats Jud. 2¹⁴. VV.²¹⁻²³. A political exposition. **21a.** YHWH himself *rent Israel from the house of David* (cf. I. 11^{11f.}, 14⁸—the schism was by divine action, but the experiment failed!), *and they made Jeroboam ben Nebat king*—they had their own way. **21b.** *And Jeroboam seduced Israel away from YHWH, and he entailed them in great sin.* **22.** *And the Bnê-Israel went in the way of all the sin [the sins] of Jeroboam which he did, not moving away from it,* **23.** *until (at last) YHWH removed Israel from his presence, as he had spoken through all his servants the prophets: and Israel went in exile away from its land to Assyria, to this day.* The exile was a just theodicy.

Criticism of this long passage, apart from minor elements, has been presented at length by Stade (*ZAW* 6=*Akad. Reden*, 208 ff.). He regards vv.²¹⁻²³, with the section's political interest and its denunciation of Jeroboam's fateful sin, as primary, belonging to the Deuteronomic editor, and vv.⁷⁻¹⁸ as a later addition; with him practically agree Benzinger, Šanda, Eissfeldt. Burney, giving his usual careful literary cross-references, while recognizing these two distinct elements, rightly argues that the secondary material may not be placed late, or indeed later. The literary flavour is that of Jeremiah and Deuteronomy. The point of view is pre-nomistic (e.g., v.¹³) and evidently pre-Exilic. The long homily is diffuse, as is the custom of most preaching, and too strict criticism of logic and order may not be made.

VV.²¹⁻⁴¹. The importation of foreign colonists into Samaria, with return, by imperial order, of exiled priests to instruct the

strangers in the cult of the native God, vv.²⁴⁻²³; the resultant amalgam of religions, combining the worship of YHWH and the imported gods, vv.^{29-34a}; a condemnation of the Israelites for their defection, vv.^{34b-40}; the mixed religion of the colonists, v.⁴¹. In this section the *Samaritans* appear by name for the only time in the O.T. (v.²⁹). For this sect, in addition to the well-known Histories and Dictionary articles, see the volumes by Montgomery, J. E. H. Thompson, and Ben Tzvi. Stade's criticism of this section has become standard (*ZAW* 6=*Akad. Reden*, 211 ff., following Wellhausen's lead in Bleek, *Einl.*⁴, 262). The section vv.^{21-34a}, with account of the imported settlers and cults, has its sequel in v.⁴¹. On the other hand vv.^{34b-40} constitute a vigorous homiletic judgment upon the Israelites for their defection from YHWH; the homily is in style of vv.^{7ff.}. The resultant composite of the two distinct documents presents the Samaritan religion as a heathen eclecticism, and this presentation has swayed subsequent opinion to regard that sect as utterly perverse, so that 'the Good Samaritan' appears as a surprise. But Samaritanism, as we know it from later definite sources, has survived, as a true Israelite religion, constituting indeed the earliest Jewish sect; the Samaritans centralized their worship on Mount Gerizim, so defying the Jewish article of faith in Jerusalem. The religious schism involved politics, as appears from Ezra, e.g., 4^{1ff.}, and for the general mixture of politics and religion in that day cf. the matrimonial alliance of the Jewish high-priestly family with that of Sanballat (Neh. 13²⁸). But the fundamental relation of the two Churches survived, we know not how in detail; the Samaritans adopted the Law, codified according to tradition by Ezra, the text being subsequently altered in places by either party in hostility to the other. There was a hardy element which survived in the North, purified as by fire, with which may be compared the experience of Judah, which had its contest with rampant heathenism, as in the reign of Manasseh, a conflict followed by the reform under Josiah and its failure, and this in turn was succeeded by the Exile, with only a 'remnant' remaining of the true Israel.

VV.^{24-34a}. 41. **24.** *And the king of Assyria brought some from Babylon and from Kuthah and from Awwa and from Hamath*

and Sepharwaim, and settled them in the cities of Samaria in place of the Bnê-Israel; and they possessed (a legal term) Samaria, and dwelt in its cities. The land had obtained its new official name, following Assyrian usage; cf. Hos. 14¹ (a proleptic use of the name in I. 13³²). The deportation from Babylon and Kuthah may be connected with the fragmentary record for his first year in Sargon's Annals (*ARA* 2, §4, cf. *CIOT* 1, 268 ff., with commentary), reporting suppression of a native uprising in Babylon (evidently headed by Merodach-baladan), as result of which "x+7 people together with their possessions I snatched away . . . in Hatti-Land (*i.e.*, Syria) I settled them." For similar deportations to Hatti-Land noted in the same Annals see *ARA* §§6, 8, while §17, for the 7th year, notes a deportation 'to Samaria.' Ezra 4^{9f.} gives a list of peoples settled in the land by Asenappar, *i.e.*, Ashurbanipal, and Winckler has argued that the present passage refers to that deportation (*Alttest. Untersuchungen*, 98, cf. Montgomery, p. 52); but the Assyrian practice of exile was too general for us to precise datings. Kuthah is identified with Tell Ibrahîm to the N of Babylon (Meissner, *Bab. u. Ass.*, Index, *s.v.*). Its name stuck as the later Jewish term of abuse for the Samaritans, 'Kuthim,' to which subject a whole Talmudic tractate, *Massecheth Kuthim*, is devoted (translation in Montgomery, ch. 11). The earliest literary use of this name appears in Josephus, *Ant.*, ix, 14, 3. Awwa appears as Iwwah in 18³⁴ in association with other Syrian cities as here. For earlier identifications see GB; Sachau has suggested Imm, between Antioch and Aleppo, Šanda notes Ammia in the Amarna tablets, not far from Gebal; Abel, *GP* 2, 256, following Dhorme, finds in it Tell Kafr 'Aya on the Orontes, SW of Homs. Hamath appears as one of Sargon's complete conquests (*KB* 2, 57; *ARA* 2, §55). From the placing of Sepharwaim with Syrian cities the earlier identification of it with Babylonian Sippar appears out of question; it may be identified with Sibraim of Eze. 47¹⁶ (aligned with Hamath), possibly Shabara'in of the Bab. Chronicle (*KB* 2, 277; *CP* 210); see Abel, *GP* 2, 456.⁵

⁵ For the older identification there may be noted the repeated combination of Babylon, Kuthah, Sippar as rebellious, *e.g.*, *ARA* 2, §§791, 796 f.

VV.²⁵⁻³⁶. The eclectic mixture of religions in the land. VV.²⁵⁻²⁸. The plague of lions is naïvely and naturally related, as though *in ipsissimis verbis* of the officials who forwarded the complaint. The present plague was due to the devastations caused by the Assyrians. Ashurbanipal records at length a similar extended plague of lions in the Babylonian marshes (*ARA* 2, §935). Centuries later the Syrian Usāma b. Munqidh of the twelfth century casually recalls in his memoirs that he “ fought lions on innumerable occasions, and killed many of them ” (Hitti’s translation, p. 173 ; *cf.* Comm., 2^{23f.}) ; for the late survival of the beast *cf.* BDD and Abel, *GP* 1, 223. There is record of such intrusions of lions in one of the quarters of Baghdad for the years 1205, 1217 ; see Reuben Levy, *A Baghdad Chronicle* (1929), 243. VV.²⁷⁻²⁸. The monarch, with accustomed imperial liberalism, accepted the suggestion of repatriation of native priests to revive the cult of the offended local deity. 27. The Heb. of the royal response is to be corrected so as to read : *Transport thither ‘some of’* [~~Ḥ~~ *one of*] *the priests whom I* [with some VSS—~~Ḥ~~ *you*] *brought thence ; and let them* [=~~Ḥ~~ *pl.*] *go and settle there, and let them* [~~Ḥ~~ *him*] *teach them the custom of the god of the land.* *N.b.* the awkward variation of numbers in ~~Ḥ~~, induced by the sequel with mention of only one priest ; some VSS independently correct. 28. A good priest came and reformed his compatriots’ religion, settling at the ancient sanctuary of Bethel. We may presume that his party had the benevolent assistance of Hezekiah ; *cf.* the tradition in 2 Ch. 30 of the latter’s invitation to his great Passover feast, when he sent messengers throughout the North, which summons was accepted by ‘ certain ’ out of some half-dozen tribes ; see Montgomery, pp. 53 ff. VV.^{29-31a}. The heathenish cults of the new settlers. 29. *And they were making each nation its god, and they deposited them in the high-place temples that the Samaritans had made, each nation in the cities where they dwell.* The suggestion is that the ancient high-places well suited those heathen. 30. *The men of Babylon made Succoth-benoth.* The second element of the deity’s name suggests that of Marduk’s consort, congenial to Babylonians, Šarpanītu, a name popularly twisted into Zēr-banītu (‘ seed-procreating ’—the Grr. here vocalize the element with *banīti*) ; see Jastrow, *Rel. Bab. u. Ass.*,

1, 115 ff. The first element was earlier identified with Sakkut, the Babylonian Saturn, whose name is to be read in Am. 5²⁶, in place of Heb. *Sikkuth* (so RV JV ; AV RV^{Am} 'tabernacle'). But far preferable is Stade's correction to 'Marduk,' so obtaining the Babylonian divine pair, Marduk and Zer-banit, reduced here to an androgynous deity, Marduk-Banit. *And the men of Kuth made Nergal*—the well-known deity of Kuthah (see Jastrow, pp. 157 f., Deimel, *Pantheon Babylonicum*, 191 ff.) *and the men of Hamath made Ashima, 31a. and the Awwites made Nibhaz and Tartak.* The name Nibhaz was early corrupted, or rather intentionally distorted; Jewish tradition attempted an abusive etymology (see Note). But the word is thus to be explained: *nbhz* < *mbhz* (by a common dissimilation) < *mzbh*, 'altar,' *i.e.*, the deified altar. Cf. the dedications Δὲ Βωμῶ μεγάλῳ and Δὲ Μαδβάχῳ (the Semitic in transliteration), Μάδβαχος also appearing paired with another deity, Σελομάνης.⁶ Cf. the deification of the Beth-el, as it appears in the Elephantine papyri. The names Tartak and Ashima represent a well-known pair in Syrian mythology. The former, תרתק, is doubtless, as recognized by Baethgen, *Beiträge zur sem. Religionsgesch.* (1888), 68, the famous goddess 'Αταργάτη, 'Ατάργατις, Hellenistic Δερκετώ, Latin, 'Derceto.' She appears on coins and inscriptions as עתרערו, עתרערתה (Lidzb. *HNE* 348, Clemen, *Lukians Schrift über die syrische Göttin*, 41), as תרתקת in Bardesanes (W. Cureton, *Spicilegium syriacum*, 1855, p. 31), and as ταργατή (Renan, *Mission en Phénicie*, 133). The present form is reduction of original עתרקה, with proper ancient Aramaic ק for *gayin*; see Montg., *JBL* 33 (1914), 78. The name, like the deity, is composite = עתר + עהה, the latter the Greek *Αττις.⁷ Outside of Syria she had a famous shrine

⁶ See Clermont-Ganneau, 'Le Zeus Madbachos et le Zeus Bomos des Sémites,' *Recueil*, 4, 164 ff., 'Zeus Naos et Zeus Bomos,' *ib.*, 7, 81 ff.; Lidzb., *Eph.*, 2, 81. The latter scholar has identified Selamanes and Madbachos with the names of two Mandaic genii; see Rosenthal, *Die aram. Forschung*, 242 f. For the deification of the altar see E. Bickermann, *Der Gott der Makkabäer* (1937), ch. 4, §4.

⁷ 'Aṭtar and 'Aṭtart, male and female, now appear in the Ugaritic texts. The Heb. counterpart for the latter is 'Ashtart (I. 11⁵, etc.). The male deity is frequent in S. Arab. texts; see Ryckmans, *NPS* 1, 27. Albr., in *JAOS* 60 (1940), 300, n. 58, denies such etymology for 'Derketo.'

at Ashkelon, and her doubtless ancient Atergateion (*cf.* II Macc. 12²⁶) at Biblical Ashtoreth-karnaim ('Ashtart-of-the-horns'). She was 'the Syrian Goddess' of Lucian of Samosata.⁸ The name Ashima appears in that of the golden image described by Lucian, §33, 'called by the Greeks *σημήιον* (Ionic Greek='Symbol'); the vocable also appears in double form in Greek tradition as *Σίμι* and *Σείμιος*, representing members of the Syrian triad. Simi is to be identified with Atargatis; *cf.* the Syrian Melito (Cureton, *Spicileg. syriacum*, pp. 44 f.), making her a daughter of 'the king Hadad.' Simios was her son, as Diodorus Siculus reports (ii, 4). This deity has been discovered in the obscure name of the deity worshipped by heathenish Israelites in Am. 8¹⁴, those 'who swear by the guilt of (*'ašmat*) Bethel (for 'Samaria' of *Ἱ*),' which is to be read 'Ashimat of Bethel,' or rather 'Ashimat of the god's house'; see T. H. Robinson, *ad loc.*, in *HAT* (1936). The latter interpretation is comparable with the obscure *אשמתיהאל*, who, along with *ענתיהאל*, 'Anat of the god's house,' appears as consort of Yahu in an Elephantine papyrus, and who is to be identified with the deity *Συμβέτυλος*, appearing in a triad along with Simios and Lion (probably the bearer of the divine throne) in an inscription from Syrian Kefr Nebo of date 223 A.D.⁹ **31b.** *And the Sepharwites were burning* [Heb.

⁸ See Bibliog. under 'Lucian'; to be consulted *inter al.*, J. G. Frazer, *Adonis, Attis, Osiris* (1907); L. B. Paton, *ERE s.v.*; F. Cumont on Atargatis and Attis in Pauly-Wissowa, *RE*, and its *Supplement*, *s.v.*; S. Ronzevalle, 'Jupiter Héliopolitain,' *Mél.*, 21 (1938), 101 ff., 126 f. Also see Eissfeldt, *Tempel u. Kulte syrischer Städte in hellenistisch-römischer Zeit* (1941), 80 f., 92 ff., 121 ff., for the Atargatis temples in Palmyra and Dura, the volume containing a valuable summary of the ancient Syrian cults that survived until a late age. For an earlier extensive treatment see Dussaud, *Notes de mythologie syrienne* (1905).

⁹ For the papyrus see Sachau, pap. 18, col. 7, Cowley, no. 22; for the Syrian inscription Lidzb., *Eph.*, 2, 323 f. See further Lidzb., vol. 3, 247, 264 f.; Cowley, pp. xviii *seq.*; Dussaud in Pauly-Wissowa, *RE*, 'Simea und Simios'; Eissf. in *ARw.*, 28 (1930), 1 ff.; Meyer, *GA* 2, 2, 165 f.; Aimé-Giron, *Textes araméens d'Égypte*, 113 ff. (with full discussion of the related themes); Vincent, *La religion des Judéo-Araméens d'Égypte*, cc. 12-15 on Anath and Asim-Betel. The origin of the element remains obscure represented as it is by two similar but differently applied names in the Greek, and by two differently vocalized forms in the Semitic. The Elephantine name, corroborated

šōrephîm] *their children in the fire to Adrammelek and Anammelek, the gods of Sepharwaim.* The form of the place-name is uncertain in the Heb. tradition ; see Note. The first divine name, as spelt here, appears as that of one of the two sons of Sennacherib who assassinated him (19³⁷), and also as a Phoen. name (Harris, *Gram.*, 75). The human name is to be explained from the element 'dr, cf. 'addir as a divine epithet, Ps. 8², so Langdon, *op. cit.*, 71. But the divine name must be rewritten as *Adad-melek*, 'Adad king,' which name as *Adad-milki* has now been read in a Mesopotamian inscription ; see Albright, *ARI* 163, with notes citing A. Bohl, *Biblica*, 22 (1941), 35 for the inscription, and with references to such cremation sacrifices to Adad. The second divine name is epithet of Anu, the ancient Sumerian god of heaven ; see Albright, 'The Evolution of the West-Semitic Deity 'An-'Ant-'Atta', *AJSL* 41 (1925), 73 ff. **32.** *And they were fearing YHWH, and they made for themselves out of their own number high-place priests, and they were celebrating for them in the high-place houses.* **33.** *YHWH they were fearing, and their own gods they were serving, according to the custom of the nations whence they (impersonal) had exiled them.* **34a.** *Unto this day they are doing according to 'their former custom' (as at v.⁴⁰ ; H the former customs).* **41.** For the connexion of this v. as sequel see above. *And these nations were fearing YHWH, and their own idols they were serving, moreover their sons and their sons' sons ; according as did their fathers, they are doing unto this day.* **32.** *Out of their own number :* as at I. 12³¹. The verb translated *celebrating* is the simple 'to do, make,' used absolutely of religious practice, as at Ex. 10²⁵ ; cf. Jesus' word at the institution of the Last Supper, "Do this in remembrance of me," and the similar use of Latin *facere*. **33.** Almost a contrast between theology and praxis is expressed here ; the final relative clause is awkwardly expressed. Read by Συμβέτυλος, might mean 'Name of the Beth-El,' and so Elssf. and Giron find the element *ism*, 'name,' or *wasm*, 'mark' ; but these are Arabisms, and do not explain the form 'ašîma and its parallels, σημήιον, etc., with the interior long vowel. Langdon (*Mythology of All Races*, 5, 22 ff.) connects the word with Akk. šîmtu, 'fate,' followed by Ronzevalle, p. 126. There was doubtless, as often in ancient eclecticism, confusion or assimilation of various etymologies. For a recapitulation of the subject, see Clemen, *op. cit.*, 42 f.

in connexion with vv.^{34b-40} this passage looks like a hateful condemnation of the Samaritan sect, as indeed it has since been historically interpreted; but the original reference was to the imported heathen, who naturally assimilated their own cults with that of the god of the land. This condition of the mixed population and culture is brilliantly illustrated by the Elephantine papyri, in which 'the Jews,' as the writers call themselves, display a religion associating Anath, Bethel, etc., as *paredroi* of Yahu; they attempted diplomatic intercourse with 'Johanah the high priest' at Jerusalem (*cf.* Neh. 12²²), and, answer failing them, they addressed 'the sons of Sanballat governor of Samaria' (Sachau, papp. 1, 3, Cowley, no. 30). These 'Jews' were a military colony imported from Samaria before the Persian conquest; *cf.* Meyer, *op. cit.*, 7 ff. For their religion see Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri*, xviii, *seq.*; Aimé-Giron, *op. cit.*, 110 ff.; A. Vincent, *op. cit.*, and Contenau's review in *Syria*, 1938, 93 ff.

VV.^{34b-40}. This passage is a condemnation of the Samaritan sect, so placed that it combines that body with the new heathenish colonists. It is of wholly Deuteronomistic strain. V.⁴¹, as noted above, is sequel of vv.^{27-34a}.

3. מנחה: Gr. transliterations as at 8⁹ (see Note); Ⓞ^L δωρα, and in the expanded text of v.⁴ both δωρα and μαννα; Ⓢ^L 'moneta.'—
 4. קָרַר: Ⓞ Ⓞ^H ἀδικίαν=Ⓢ^H; Ⓞ^L ἐπιβουλήν=Ⓢ^L; Aq., Quinta, 'deceit'; Ⓞ^L 'rebellion,' *cf.* Ⓢ^L 'rebellare nitens'; for the present phrase *cf.* Jer. 11⁹.—טִיא: B *al.*, Σηγωρ; Hex., Σωα (Jos., Σωαν)=Ⓢ^L Ⓢ^L ('Sua'); it is probably to be vocalized as טִיא (St., *BH*), see Comm. Ⓞ^L replaces מַצְרַיִם טִיא טִיא אל טִיא with *προς Ἀδραμμελεχ τ. Αἰθιοπα τ. κατοικουντα εν Αιγυπτω*; see Rahlfs's discussion (SS 3, 114 f.) of this aberration as basis of a listing in Theophilus (*Ad Autolyicum*, ii, 31) of an Ἀδραμμελεχ Αἰθιοψ among the Ass. kings, proving that this rdg. of the 2d cent. A.D. well preceded Lucian.—ויעצרוהו, ויאסרוהו: see *SBOT* for proposals to eliminate one or the other of the phrases, but the first verb expresses legal 'detention'; an example of arbitrary emendation is Cheyne's rewriting ויעורוהו, 'and blinded him' (*EB* 2127).—5. ויעל *bis*: for many corrections of this repetition see St. in *SBOT*, who soberly leaves the text untouched; the phrase 'to go up against' is the common military term for 'campaigning,' as at v.³ (see *BDB* 748b).—6. בשנת ההשעיה (MSS, correcting, 'בשנת הת'): construction as at 25¹, etc.; *cf.* GK §134, p. Ⓞ^L Ⓞ^L Ⓢ^L Ⓢ^L pref. 'and,' without authority.—נהר: Grr. Ⓢ^H as pl., *i.e.*, Halah and Habor as 'rivers of Gozan.'—גוֹן: Grr. correctly, exc. B v, Γωζαρ, e Γωζαρ.—ערי: Grr., Ⓢ^H as though

הָרִי : *n.b.* the intruded הָרִי, 1 Ch. 5²⁶.—At end 𐤇^L+ ‘unto this day,’ from Ch.—7. For the long protasis see Comm. ; 𐤇^L found rhetorical difficulty, and expanded with “and the Lord’s anger was against Israel (because)”—‘superior,’ says Burney—but not original!—8. וּמַלְכֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר עָשׂוּ : MS 70 om. וּמַלְכֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, and so Gr. N+12 MSS, 𐤇^H ✕ ; 𐤇^A om. the whole clause. VSS vary in rendering ; attempts at explanation by Then., Klost. ; but with Burn., St., Šanda, the passage is an evident intrusion.—9. וַיִּהְיוּ : Grr. with the verb ἀμφόδεω, ‘to clothe,’ as from root הָפַע, and so Rashi, Kimchi interpret, ‘they concealed its interpretation’ (Kimchi) ; *cf.* BDB, ‘to do secretly,’ and König, *HAW* ; 𐤇 ‘operuerunt’ ; see proposed corrections in GB, and the long note by Haupt with an original etymology ; Ehrl. *cf.* Hps. 12¹, but without clarifying the word here. Correct interpretation appears to come from the Akk. with root ḥapū, ‘to utter,’ which actually = 𐤇 𐤇^A ; see V. Scheil, *Nouveaux vocabulaires babyloniens* (1919), 12 f. (adducing also the present passage) ; *cf.* G. R. Driver in Peake, *The People and the Book*, 89.—אֲשֶׁר לֹא בָן : *cf.* 7⁹, לֹא בָן ; אֲשֶׁר is used like Aram. רִי, רִי, and a similar case appears in Syr. with לֹא in Bardesanes, Cureton, *Spicilegium syriacum* (1855), 11, lines 10 f. ; similar is Akk. *ša lā* ; *cf.* also Haupt’s note.—11. וְכָל בְּמוֹת : unnecessary after שָׁם, prob. introduced to add to the indictment, elided by St., Šanda.—דְּבָרִים רַעִים : Grr., κοινωσους κ. ἐχαραξαν, “partners, and they irritated” = 𐤇^H. Klost. would rashly reconstruct the Gr. into κιναιδους κ. εταιριδας, but 𐤇 read the first word as הַבְּרִים. Gr. j and an 𐤇 text = 𐤇.—12. וַיְעַד : generally understood as Hif. of עָד, whence עֵד, ‘witness’ ; for proposed Akk. connexion of עָד as root *w’d* = *y’d*, ‘to command,’ see Haupt, *ad loc.*, and GB ; the former derives the verb from the same source ; there may be paronomasia between the roots in the Heb. words.—כָּל נְבִיאֵי כָל הוּא : Kr. נְבִיאֵי, as ‘all prophets of all vision,’ with הָ as at Is. 28¹⁵—doubtless to avoid reference to seers ; Grr. as נְבִיאָיו = 𐤇^H ; but read הָ וְכָל נְבִיאֵי with MSS 30 153 253 (for variations see deR.) = 𐤇^L (translating with ‘every scribe and every teacher’), 𐤇, modern VSS.—הַקּוֹתִי : 28 MSS Ken., deR., הָ = VSS, modern VSS, which is required, unless the word is an ‘exuberant gloss’ (St.).—אֵלֶיכֶם : OGrr., 𐤇 as = להם ; but the commands are ‘for you.’—13. כְּעַרְףְּ אֲבוֹתָם : text of 𐤇 shortened by parablepsis with אֲבוֹתָם, v. 15 ; 𐤇^L 𐤇^H variously supply the loss ; see St.—14. הוּא : B v g om. κυριος, 𐤇^H ✕.—15. כָּל : OGrr. om., softening the indictment, 𐤇^H ✕.—16. וַיִּתְחַשׂוּ : the root has its liquid variant in חָשׂ, *cf.* Ps. 58⁶. From the latter root there appears לחַשׂ, ‘charm,’ in an Aram. magical text published by Du Mesnil du Buisson in *Mélanges Syriens* . . . René Dussaud, 1, 421 ff. The variant forms appear to have the mng. ‘to hiss,’ used of the magicians who ‘squeak and gibber.’ Dhorme (cited above) thinks of serpent-charmers.—17. כִּי קָרַע יִשְׂרָאֵל מַעַל בֵּית דָּוִד : for

the theme *cf.* 1 Sam. 15²⁸, I. 11¹²; $\text{G}^L \text{U}$ the verb as passive, with 'Israel' as subject, and similarly S ; A "Jeroboam made separation in Israel"—all attempts to avoid the divine agency. G^H $\sigma\tau\iota$ $\pi\lambda\eta\nu$ $\text{I}\sigma\rho\alpha\eta\lambda$ $\epsilon\pi\alpha\nu\omega\theta\epsilon\nu$ $\alpha\iota\kappa\omicron\nu$ $\Delta\alpha\upsilon\epsilon\iota\delta$ (= S^H); see St.'s criticism of Kamph.'s effort to rewrite Heb. on this inscrutable basis.— I דא Kt., וידא Kt.: the latter as Kt. in 19 MSS Ken., deR., appearing also in Bab. Talmud; the verb דא is used of feminine seduction, Prov. 7²¹, and similarly of false prophets, Dt. 13^{6ff.}.—22. המאות: many MSS המאת, and so to be read as sing. (*cf.* v. 21), in consonance with foll. מטנה, and so $\text{G}^L \text{U}$.—23. דבר: 1 MSS +יהיה=Grr., S .—24. ומכוחה: B *al.*, $\tau\omicron\nu$ [$\epsilon\kappa$ X.], error for *κα*. The dissyllable (the acc. of direction replacing the nominative form)=Grr. (B $\chi\omicron\upsilon\sigma\upsilon\theta\alpha$); in v. 30 G^L has the same for כוחות.— G^L [ומ]פא: MSS עה; *cf.* עה, 18³⁴; B *al.* om. *κα*.— G^L וספרוים=Hex.; Kt.^{or} ויפס= G^L .—27. משם . . . אחר [שמה]: lost by parablepsis in Grr., exc. G^L ; S^H \times .—הגליתם= S^H S ; 1 MS הגליתם= $\text{G}^L \text{U}$ A ; the latter rdg. preferable, *cf.* the 2d pers. sing., v. 26.—וישבו וישבו= G^L Hex.; the other VSS as sing., in agreement with אחר above.—וירם: G^L Hex., U =וירם; see Comm. for omission of אחר and the retention of the pl. in the three verbs.—[הארץ]: אלהי: MS 30, B om., as heathenish.—29. בבית הכמות: for the composite pl., also in v. 32, see Note, I. 12³¹.—30. פכות ננות: for the first word Grr., $\sigma\omicron\chi\chi\omega\theta$, etc. (B $\rho\omicron\chi\chi\omega\theta$), for the second B $\beta\alpha\upsilon\upsilon\theta\epsilon\iota$, A $\beta\epsilon\upsilon\theta\epsilon\iota$, etc.; *n.b.* survival of the final Akk. vowel; see Comm. for correction to the form. For such a distortion of the first name *cf.* 'Marduk' to 'Nisrok,' 19³⁷.—גרנל: B ι $\tau\eta\nu$ $\text{E}\rho\gamma\epsilon\lambda$; *al.*, $\tau\eta\nu$ (G^L $\tau\omicron\nu$) $\text{N}\eta\rho\iota\gamma\epsilon\lambda$; the fem. article used as in η $\text{B}\acute{\alpha}\delta\lambda$.—31. נבחו: with 'large *zayin*' (see GK §5, n), indicating a variant spelling, which appears in a few MSS, U , as נבחן, and so *Sanhedrin*, 63b, etymologizing from the root 'to bark like a dog.' Exc. A, $\tau\eta\nu$ $\text{N}\alpha\iota\beta\alpha\varsigma$, and *Onom. Gr.*, $\text{N}\alpha\zeta\epsilon\beta$ =*Onom. Lat.*, Grr. have an entirely different word, $\tau\eta\nu$ $\text{E}\beta\lambda\alpha\zeta\epsilon\beta$, etc. Hommel has suggested for this name, as also for Tartak, Elamite origin (Haupt Commemoration Vol., 159 ff.). For recovery of the original see Comm.—הספרוים: exc. the Three and G^L , the Grr. as a deity, B $\tau\eta\nu$ $\text{S}\epsilon\pi\phi\alpha\rho\omicron\nu\upsilon$, etc.= S^H .—אָרְרִקְלָהּ, Kt.^{or} אָרְרִקְלָהּ: read אָרְרִקְלָהּ, as suggested by Winckler in *KTAT*, and see Comm.—וענומך: G^L om.—אלה ספרוים: Kt. corrects the first word to אלהי=VSS, and the second to ספרוים, and so many MSS Kt.; the place-name has been distorted to correspond with the gentilic above; *cf.* the place-names proposed for identification in Comm., v. 24, and to be read, 'Siphraim,' or the like.— G^L pref. a long doublet to the v., but it is difficult to see why Burn. regards it as superior to U ; *cf.* Rahlfs, SS 3, 290.—33. הנלו: OGrr. as sing., with the Lord understood as subj.; U as passive.—34. כמשפטם הראשנים: = U ; G^L supplies a clumsy doublet=כמשפטם הראשנים= U ; G^L supplies a clumsy doublet=כמשפטם הראשנים (see Rahlfs, *ib.*, 246); the last rdg. appears in v. 40, and is preferable, with the collective sense of the noun.—אינם *bis*: G^L Hex.

om., and further om. *אם יהיה* on the basis that "they were fearing and yet doing acc. to their own statutes," etc.—*כהקדם וכמשפטם* : prob. an addition from v.³⁷, and so om. the foll. conj. ; or read *בהקדמו וכמשפטו*.—38. *ברתי* : VSS, exc. *Ⓢ*, as 3d sing., *ברת*, which appears preferable ; but the writer may have fallen artlessly into the divine first person.

CC. 18–20. The reign of Hezekiah of Judah. || 2 Ch. 29–32, and for 18¹³–20 the duplicate in Is. 36–39. Cf. *Ant.*, ix, 13–x, 2.¹

18¹–8. Introduction to the reign (vv.¹–²) ; the king's unique piety (vv.³–⁸), including two archival notes (vv.⁴–⁸). Hezekiah (725–696 B.C.) was contemporary of Shalmaneser, Sargon II (722–705), Sennacherib (705–681). With the fate of Samaria before his eyes, and in spite of the Assyrian terror, he reversed the international and religiously eclectic policy of his father Ahaz (cf. 16^{7ff.}), at a seemingly providential period abandoned submission to Assyria, struck out on his own hand against the Philistine neighbours, weakened as they were by Assyrian control, and introduced a religious reformation. For the first time one of the Canonical Prophets appears in the active politics of the state in the person of Isaiah. The ancient Israelite spirit was revived by a prophetic movement, exhibited also in Micah, as had been the case in the North in the preceding century, there without permanence, but here on a surer foundation. The policy of Hezekiah as statesman was : Israel for its God and itself alone. Much has been made of apparent contrast between the king and the great prophet, and in consequence scepticism has been largely addressed to the present statements of the former's sincerity and reforms. But Hezekiah was primarily statesman, and as such he stood for the cause of the Prophets, even as did Constantine with his political limitations for the Christian religion of his day. For a reasonable discussion of the problem see Robinson at length, *HI* 389 ff., and *e.g.*, p. 393 : "We need not doubt Hezekiah's sincerity if we see in this reform a political gesture, for patriotism and religious loyalty went hand in hand in ancient Israel." Even more positively than Robinson, who finds in Isaiah's silence in regard to Hezekiah a cause of doubt, Kittel (*GVI* 2, 373 f.) refuses "to surrender the narrative concerning his

¹ For the literature see Additional Note after ch. 20, especially n. 1. Some references below are to literature cited there.

reformation." It is true that when religious reform enters the field of politics, it has rough sailing. Hezekiah was succeeded by a Manasseh, Josiah by a Jehoiakim. But a 'Remnant' was being disciplined to survive, and faith was to be basis of survival (Is. 7³⁻¹⁹). See further Additional Note, n. 4.

The two archival notes in the section are introduced by the emphatically expressed initial *He* without conjunction (cf. Comm., 14⁷). 4. The v. briefly describes the religious reformation. *He removed the high-places, and broke up the pillars, and cut down the Asherah, and cut up the brass serpent, which Moses had made; for up to those days the Bnê-Israel were burning incense to it; and it was called Nehushtan.* The removal of *high-places* and *pillars*, the inheritance of primitive cult, was drastic indeed; for *the Asherah* cf. 17^{10.16}. *The serpent of brass* [nēḥaš han-nēḥōšet, with play on the two words] called *Nehushtan*, was a surviving ancient fetich, coming down, as the annalist artlessly recorded, from Moses' day and authority (Num. 21^{4ff.}). For the archæological object of the serpent and its wide field in Palestine, Egypt and Mesopotamia, see Benzinger, *Arch.*, 328; Albright, 'The Goddess of Life and Wisdom,' *AJSL* 36 (1920), 258 ff.; Cook, *Rel. of Anc. Israel*, 98 f., 117, 220; H. Frankfort, *Iraq*, 1 (1934), 9 ff.; Graham and May, *Culture and Conscience*, Index, s.v.; H. H. Rowley, 'Zadok and Nehushtan,' *JBL* 58 (1939), 113 ff. For a serpent-stele discovered at Tell Beit Mirsim see Albright, *BASOR* 31 (1928), and *ZAW* 47 (1929), 6 f. *N.b.* the *Serpent Spring* of I. 1⁹. Such antique survivals in higher religion are abundantly paralleled in the Christian Church and Islam. The second archival note is introduced with editorial explanation of Hezekiah's success. 7. *And YHWH being with him in all that he set out on, he was prospering. And he rebelled against the king of Assyria, and did not serve him.* 8. *He smote Philistia as far as Gaza and its borders, from watchmen's tower to fortified city.* This was an overt act of rebellion against Assyria's claims. Sargon records the defeat of Egypt at Raphia on the border for 713 B.C., involving capture of Hanno king of Gaza, and at length, in two inscriptions for 711 B.C., a successful campaign against Azuri king of Ashdod and his allies, Gath, Ashkelon, Meluḥḥa, in which connexion, "the people of Philistia, Judah, Edom, Moab, those who live by the sea . . .

brought tribute . . . to Ashur my lord." (See *KB* 2, 55, 66 ff. ; *CP* 328 ff. ; *ATB* 1, 349 ff. ; *ARA* 2, §§5, 30, 62, 80 ; *AB* 468.) The attack was a border warfare, belonging doubtless to the troubled years at the end of Sargon's reign and the beginning of Sennacherib's. A revival of the Philistines had occurred in Ahaz's reign according to 2 Ch. 28¹⁸ ; cf. the oracle attributed to Isaiah as of the death-year of Ahaz (Is. 14^{28ff.}). In line with this concern in Philistia was Hezekiah's interference in the affairs of Ekron with its rebellion against Sennacherib, as reported in the latter's inscription ; see below.

VV.⁵⁻⁶. These statements on Hezekiah's faithfulness to his God, couched in Deuteronomic language—' cleaving to יהוה,' ' not turning away from him '—are logically introduced between the reform at home and the success abroad. The statement that *after him there was none like him among all the kings of Judah* is later contradicted by the absolute statement on Josiah's virtue (23²⁵). The following clause, *and who were before him*, is a clumsy addition. There was another illustrious phase of the reign according to the tradition of ' the men of Hezekiah ' and their proverbs (Prov. 25-29), which tradition Gemser in his Comm. (*HAT* 1937) regards as quite authentic. A royal parallel two generations later would be Ashurbanipal, who extols at length his own education and wisdom (*ARA* 2, §986, and cf. Kittel, *GVI* 2, 378).

VV.⁹⁻¹². The item of the fall of Samaria, repeated almost verbatim from 17⁵⁻⁶, which an early editor desired to place chronologically in Hezekiah's reign, and with rendering of Hoshea's year-terms into those of his contemporary. **10.** *And he* [with the parallel and most VSS ; H *they*] *took it at the end of three years, even in year six of Hezekiah ; it was year nine of Hoshea king of Israel that Samaria was taken.* **12.** A repetitive moralizing judgment.

V.¹³-ch. 19. An apparently continuous history of Sennacherib's operations against Jerusalem, paralleled in Is. 36, 37 ; see Additional Note.

VV.¹³⁻¹⁶. This initial section stands apart as of annalistic character with its curt detail, without moral judgment, while one arithmetical figure for the tribute to Sennacherib is exactly that in the latter's own inscription. The section of this inscription, the Taylor Prism, col. iii, lines 1 ff., for the king's

third year and his campaign in 701 B.C., is the most famous of Assyrian texts bearing upon Bible history. For the translation see *CIOT* 2, 281 ff. (still of value for its notes); *KB* 2, 280 ff.; *CP* 340 ff. (these three with the transliterated text); *AKAT*, 176 ff.; *ATB* 1, 352 ff.; *ARA* 2, §§309 ff.;² *AB* 471 f. This great campaign covered Palestine as far as Eltekeh in the old Danite territory (Jos. 19⁴¹, 21²³). Sennacherib specifically names a number of cities, practically all in the Philistine territory, among them Ekron, whose 'loyal' king Padi had been committed by rebels to 'Hezekiah king of Judah,' from which arrest the Assyrian reclaimed him, restoring him to his throne along with condign punishment of the rebels. This interference of Hezekiah in his neighbours' affairs, evidently as arch-conspirator against Assyria, is paralleled by the brief notice of his successful campaign in Philistia (v.⁸).

13. *And in the fourteenth year of king Hezekiah Sennacherib king of Assyria came up against all the fortified cities of Judah and seized them.* The date is contradicted by the Assyrian chronology. It may be a scribal miswriting of '24,' which would give the correct date; or the figure was induced by the statement of the promise to Hezekiah of an additional 15 years of life (20⁶), *i.e.*, 29-15=14. The v. was earlier regarded by Stade as original introduction to vv.^{17ff.}, but in *SBOT* he distinguishes vv.^{13. 16. 14. 15. 17ff.} as from as many distinct sources. But barring the date, or with correction of it, the v. is necessary introduction to vv.^{14ff.}; indeed the whole section is the one part of the narrative definitely supported by external history. For *all the fortified cities* cf. Sennacherib (after Rogers's tr.): "Forty-six strong cities, with walls, the smaller cities which were around them . . . I besieged and captured." Cf. the expression in v.⁸ for the two classes of fortresses, and see R. P. Dougherty, 'Sennacherib and the Walled Cities of Judah,' *JBL* 49 (1930), 160 ff., with valuable references to the strength of the Palestinian fortifications as demonstrated by archæology. With this citation cf. Sennacherib's manifesto in the Nebi Yūnus inscription (presented in the authorities cited above): "I destroyed the broad district

² The text used by Luckenbill is that of a duplicate cylinder ('an even more perfect copy'), acquired by the University of Chicago in 1920, and published by him in his *Annals of Sennacherib* (1924).

of Judah ; I laid my yoke upon Hezekiah its king." **14a.** *And Hezekiah king of Judah (n.b. the formal title) sent message to the king of Assyria to Lachish*——. For the city see Comm., 14¹⁹. Famous are Sennacherib's reliefs, the one graphically presenting the siege of Lachish, the other portraying the king seated on his throne with the captives filing before him, and the accompanying inscription : "Sennacherib, king of the world, king of Assyria, seated himself on a throne, and the prisoners of Lachish marched before him." For the text see the authorities cited, and for the reliefs A. H. Layard, *The Monuments of Nineveh* (1849), 2, pl. 23 ; Stade, *GVI* 1, plate after p. 620 ; Rogers, *HBA* 2, plates opp. pp. 370, 374 ; Benzinger, *Arch.*, 309 ; Olmstead, *HA* fig. 127 ; Barton, *AB* fig. 298. **14b.** —*saying : I have rebelled. Turn away from me. What thou puttest upon me I will bear. And the king of Assyria imposed upon Hezekiah king of Judah 300 talents of silver and 30 talents of gold.* The first verb is technical expression of rebellion, and the same root is constantly so used in Akk. ; its usual equivalent in the English Bible is 'to sin.' For Hezekiah's capitulation, but without surrender of the city, the Taylor Prism records for the end of the Palestinian campaign (lines 20 ff.) : " (Hezekiah) himself I shut up like a caged bird within Jerusalem, his royal city. I cast up entrenchments against him, and whosoever came forth from the gate of his city I punished (?) him." There follows the list of conquered districts detached from Judah, and then : "As for Hezekiah the fear of the majesty of my dominion overwhelmed him, and the Urbi, and the regular troops, whom he had brought in to strengthen Jerusalem his royal city, deserted." Then is given the list of articles of ransom by which Hezekiah avoided surrender of the city : "30 talents of gold, 800 talents of silver, precious stones . . . ivory seats and couches . . . woods . . . ; and his daughters, the women of his palace, male and female musicians he dispatched after me to Nineveh my capital city. He sent his ambassador to give tribute and make submission." This text apprises us of Hezekiah's extensive military preparations as well as of one reason leading him to come to terms, viz., the defection of his mercenaries ; it also describes the luxury found in Jerusalem, for which condition is to be compared the tradition of

Hezekiah's wealth in 2 Ch. 32^{27ff.}. The 'Urbi' are probably Arabs; for the variations of 'arab in Heb. see Montgomery, *Arabia and the Bible*, 29. The two reports agree as to 'the 30 talents of gold.' The discrepancy between the '300 talents' of Ki. and the '800' of the Prism has been explained as due to the difference between the 'light' and the 'heavy' talent; for this distinction see Nowack, *Arch.*, 1, 207 f., *KAT* 341 f., Rogers, *HBA* 2, 371 (estimating [1915] the tribute at \$5,650,000), and especially Lehmann-Haupt in Pauly-Wissowa, *RE Suppl.* 3 (1918), 601, assuming here the ratio between the Phœnician double talent and the Babylonian light talent. For the talent *cf.* also Comm. above, I. 9¹⁴. The problem is a vexed one, with standards of different ages and economies to reckon with, along with variations in the written tradition, *e.g.*, the difference of figures between **𐤇** and **𐤆** at I. 10²⁹. Error, if there be, may lie in the Assyrian figure, for figures in the Assyrian texts contradict themselves; a case in point is given by Rogers, *ib.*, 359. A romantic sidelight for the Biblical student upon the item of 'his daughters, the women of his palace,' following the observation of Landsberger and Bauer (*ZA* 3 [1926], 65) that Sennacherib's forceful wife Naḫīya-zakūtu was a Babylonian Aramæan, has been cast by Meissner (*Sb.*, Berlin Acad., 1932, 58), preferring to regard her as a 'Westerner,' even 'probably a Jewess.'

15. *And Hezekiah gave all the silver (i.e., specie) that was found in YHWH's house and in the treasuries of the king's house.*

16. *At that time Hezekiah cut up the doors of the hall [hêkāl, cf. I. 6³, etc.] of YHWH and the door-posts [?], which Hezekiah king of Judah had overlaid, and gave them to the king of Assyria [EVV here are not literal]. V.¹⁶, with the introductory *at that time*, is an independent item, apparently culled from temple archives. For a similar despoliation of sacred and royal treasures *cf.* that in Rehoboam's reign, I. 14^{25. 26}. The gilded *door-posts* (the unique word is uncertain, VSS vary) represent Hezekiah's very probable restoration and enrichment of the temple. Criticism of the statement that he was such a renovator has been expressed by critics, and his name has been replaced with that of Solomon (Klostermann), Azariah (Stade), Azariah or Joash (Šanda); but it is vain to essay such change of names.*

V.¹⁷-ch. 19. An extract from memoirs of Isaiah, found in duplicate in Is. 36, 37. Two apparently parallel stories, 18¹⁷-19⁷ and 19⁸⁻³⁷, succeeding the item above of Hezekiah's submission, narrating further Assyrian demands for full surrender, arouse suspicion as to their historicity, while their inclusion, along with ch. 20, in the book which bears the prophet's name involves them in the large problem of the alleged Isaianic histories and prophecies. Critical discussion at large is postponed to the Additional Note.

V.¹⁷-19⁷. A fruitless demand of the Assyrian king for the surrender of Jerusalem, and a prophetic oracle from Isaiah. VV.¹⁷⁻²⁵. The demand for surrender. 17. *And the king of Assyria sent (the) Tartan and (the) Rab-saris and (the) Rab-shakeh from Lachish to king Hezekiah with a stout force to Jerusalem. And they went up and came to Jerusalem. And they went up and came* [Is. om.] and [Is. he] stood at the conduit of the Upper Pool, the one at the highway of Fuller's Field. 18. *And they called to the king* [Is. om.]. *And there went out to them [Is. him] Eliakim ben Hilkiyah, He-Over-the-House, and Shebna the Secretary, and Joah ben Asaph the Recorder.* The text of Ki. is expanded and otherwise varied: *and they went up and came* is a duplicate; probably the whole double passage, lacking in Is., is secondary; the 'calling to the king' also looks secondary; Is. is original in ignoring the first two officials named, the Tartan (title for an Assyrian generalissimo) and the Rab-saris, since the Rab-shakeh alone appears in the subsequent parleys. As Stade remarks, with subsequent general consent, the intrusion of the first two officials was due 'to the antiquarian learning of a later reader'; they may have been introduced to make the diplomatic parties even in number. The Tartan appears in Is. 20¹; for the Rab-saris (also Jer. 39³) and Rab-shakeh see Note. 17. *The conduit of the Upper Pool*, etc. The same phrase appears in Is. 7³ as of the place where Isaiah and his son Shear-jashub accosted king Ahaz; but the time of that event precedes Hezekiah's excavation of the Siloam conduit to the pool within the city, recorded below, 20²⁰. The location of this Upper Pool is still disputed, whether it be a pool at the south of the Akra fed by the old surface aqueduct (for a Lower Pool see Is. 22⁹), or one on the north side of the city, e.g., the

modern Birket Mamilla. G. A. Smith defends the former view (*Jerusalem*, I, ch. 5, esp. p. 105), while Gray (comm. on Is. 7³) and Šanda at length (pp. 250-3) prefer the latter. The exact geographical data speak for the first identification, and yet such a parley over the walls hardly suits the Kedron valley front of the city. This reference may well be an invention, suggested by Is. 7³. **18.** For the titles of the three officials *cf.* the list of Solomon's officers, I. 4^{2ff.}. In the Isaianic ode, Is. 22^{15ff.}, Shebna, here Scribe, there Over-the-House, is denounced, and Eliakim, here Over-the-House, it is predicted, will replace him upon his coming degradation. For that obscure section see the articles by A. Kamphausen, in *AJT*, 1901, 43 ff.; K. Fullerton, *ib.*, 1903, 621 ff.; E. König, *ib.*, 675 ff., and the full critical survey by Gray, *Isaiah*, *ad loc.* Explanation has been offered for the changes of rank of the two officials as due to administrative shifts in the modern sense. H. G. May doubts whether the Shebna of Ki. and the Shebna of Is. are identical in person (*AJSL* 56 [1939], 147).

VV.¹⁹⁻²⁵. The Rab-shakeh's address, a notable diplomatic argument, authentic in colour, even if literally fiction; *cf.* the orations reported by Greek and Roman historians. **19.** *And (the) Rab-shakeh said to them: Say ye now to Hezekiah (n.b. the rude omission of the latter's title): Thus has spoken the Great King (=Akk. šarru rabū—the royal title), the king of Assyria: What is this trust that thou trustest in?* **20.** *Thou sayest (the verb expresses formulated thought): Counsel and might for war are mere lip-matter (the same satirical phrase, Prov. 14²³). Now on whom dost thou trust that thou hast rebelled against me?* **21.** *Now see!—thou hast put thy trust upon the staff of this broken reed, upon Egypt, a kind one leans upon, and it goes into his palm and pierces it—so is Pharaoh king of Egypt for all who trust in him.* **22.** *And if ye say to me, Upon YHWH our God we trust, is it not he whose high-places and altars Hezekiah has removed, while he said to Judah and Jerusalem: Before this altar ye shall worship in Jerusalem?* **23.** *And now, take [sing. verb] a wager with my lord, the king of Assyria: I will give thee two thousand horses, if thou canst put riders upon them.* **24.** *How then canst thou turn the face of [H+a satrap] one of the least of my lord's servants? And thou hast trusted on Egypt*

for chariotry and steeds! **25.** And [with MSS, Is.] now, without YHWH have I gone up against this place, to destroy it? YHWH did command me, Go up against this land and destroy it! The blustering oration is a satirical presentation of Assyrian arrogance, and a counterpart of the monuments. The bet of two thousand cavalry men is not an exaggeration; cavalry was never an important arm of the Israelite military; see Comm., I. 1⁵, 10². Critical dubiety exists as to the alleged statement in v.²², involving the problem of the date of the reformation. It is more important to note that such matters of local religious import were well known to the wise Assyrian chancellery, which had its 'secret service.'

VV.²⁶⁻³⁶. The plea of the royal commission that the parley be held in the diplomatic foreign language, and the Rabshakeh's reply that he speaks on purpose to the common people and to all. **26.** And said Eliakim ben Hilkiah [and Shebna and Joah] [Is. om.] to (the) Rab-shakeh: Speak now to thy servants in Aramaic, for we are listening, and do not speak with us in Jewish in the hearing of the people on the wall. **27.** And (the) Rab-shakeh said [D+to them; Is. om.]: To thy lord and to thee has my lord sent me to speak these words? Is it not to the men who sit on the wall, a-eating their own dung and a-drinking their own piss with you? **28.** And (the) Rab-shakeh stood up, and called out with a loud voice in Jewish; and he spoke and said: Hear ye the word of the Great King, the king of Assyria! **29.** Thus has spoken the king: Let not Hezekiah deceive you, for he cannot deliver you from my [with many MSS, VSS; D his] hand; **30.** nor let Hezekiah make you trust on YHWH, saying: YHWH will surely deliver us, and this city will not be given into the king of Assyria's hand. **31.** Listen not to Hezekiah, for thus has spoken the king of Assyria: Salute me, and come out to me, and eat each of his vine and each of his fig-tree, and drink each of the water of his cistern, **32.** until I come and take you to a land like your land, a land of corn and must, a land of bread and vineyards, a land of oil-olive and honey, and so keep alive and die not! And listen not to Hezekiah, for he would beguile you with "YHWH will deliver us!" **33.** Did the gods of the peoples ever deliver each one his own land from the king of Assyria's hand? **34.** Where are the gods of Hamath and Arpad, where the gods of Sepharwaim

[~~It~~ + *Henah and Iwwah*; Is. om.]—*for did they deliver Samaria out of my hand?* 35. *Who among all the land-gods are they that have delivered their land out of my hand, that YHWH should deliver Jerusalem from my hand?* 36. *And the people kept silence, and answered him not a word, for it was the king's command, to wit, Do not answer him!*

VV.^{26. 27}. However dubious this report of the oration may be, the reference to the Aramaic as the *lingua franca* of the empire is of interest.³ 'Jewish' (Heb.= 'judaice') occurs also in Neh. 13²⁴; the speaker is not using the word with any fine dialectical sense. Interesting is the note that the Assyrian could speak Hebrew, but this doubtless through an interpreter. He will speak to the common people, who best know their own interest. We may compare much current political propaganda of our own day. The indelicate language (corrected by the K_r.) refers to the privations of the siege, cf. 6²⁵. Šanda notes a similar double-phrased crudity of Sennacherib's in the Taylor Prism, col. vi, 20 f. (KB 2, 110, ARA 2, §254, with identity in one term, *šīnāti*=Heb. *sinê-hem*). VV.²⁸⁻³⁰. There is no denial of YHWH's deity; denial of his power as against Assyria is reserved for the climax, vv.^{31f.} VV.^{31. 32}. In persuasive tone an *argumentum ad populum* is offered. They need only to make courteous salutation; 'salute me' translates Heb. 'make with me blessing,' the correspondent noun 'peace' being used of greeting between gentlemen, as at 4²⁹. The proposed deportation did not necessarily involve great hardship; there might be compared the lot of the *émigrés* from foreign parts into the happy land of Samaria (17²¹), while later the prosperity of the Jewish exiles in Babylonia was exhibited by their unwillingness to return home, as indicated by the small figure of the party that accompanied Ezra (Ezra 8^{1ff.}). VV.³³⁻³⁵. The flaunting disrespect for other

³ For the cosmopolitan spread of that language see H. H. Rowley, *The Aramaic of the O.T.* (1929), 1 ff., for its official position in the Persian empire H. H. Schaeder, *Iranische Beiträge I* (1930), and the comprehensive volume by Rosenthal, *Die Aramaistische Forschung*, esp. Section I, ch. 2, 'Das Reichsaramäische.' Naville has argued in ch. 3 of his *Text of the O.T.* that 'Jewish' here means the Judæan language in contrast to the rest of Palestine, which, he holds, spoke and wrote only Aramaic. But a local speaker would so speak of his tongue, even as a Scotsman claims that he talks 'Scotch.'

gods than Assyria's own is here finally expressed, and, if might be right, the envoy spoke plausible truth. With all its brutality the Assyrian empire is to be credited with one ideological development, the formulation of a divine-imperial monocracy, centering in its deity Ashur, even as Rome later attempted an official religion to offset the religious disunities of the empire.⁴ 34a. In addition to Hamath (*cf.* 17³⁰), Arpad is named; for the city and its submission to Assyria in 740 B.C. see Honigman, *RA s.v.* V.^a is practically duplicate to 19¹³ (there 'the kings' in place of 'the gods') and is secondary to it. V.^b. *Where are the gods of Sepharwaim, Hena and Iwwah? Did they deliver Samaria out of my hand?*, is most parenthetically attached, and is nonsense in the connexion. G¹ and an L text fill out with an insertion preceding the second question: *Where are the gods of the land of Samaria?*, and this plus has been accepted by most critics since Klostermann (*e.g.*, *BH*). But Rahlfs's vigorous objection (*SS* 3, 278), regarding the addition as a 'clever' insertion in condemnation of heathen Samaritanism to fill out the lacuna, is to be maintained. In fact the whole v. appears to be secondary to 19¹³. See Note further. VV.^{36. 37}. The silence of the people by royal order, and the report to the king by his officials with their clothes rent.

Ch. 19^{1. 2}. Hezekiah performs the ritual acts of humiliation in the temple in seeking a divine response, and sends *Eliakim, Over-the-House, and Shebna the Secretary, and the elders of the priests, covered with sackcloth, to Isaiah 'ben Amos the prophet'* [so the correct order with Is.]. 3. The message of the king is introduced with a couplet.

*A day of distress and reproach: and contumely is this day,
For children have come to the breach: and no strength for
the birth.*

V.⁴. Although himself in the temple, the king asks the prayers of the extra-ecclesiastical prophet; in the parallel story he himself "prayed before YHWH" (vv.^{14ff.}). *The remnant that*

⁴ *Cf.* Jastrow, *Religious Belief in Babylonia and Assyria* (1908), 50 ff.; J. Hehn, *Die biblische u. die babylon. Gottesidee* (1913), 89 ff., a chapter on the attitude of Babylonian religion towards monotheism.

is left: a frequent post-Exilic term: but it has place here politically, *cf.* the name of Isaiah's son, 'Remnant-shall-return' (Is. 7³), and actually a most extensive exile is corroborated by Sennacherib's boast in the Taylor Prism (col. iii, 17 ff.): "200,150 men, young, old, male and female, horses, mules, asses, camels, oxen and sheep, without number, I brought them out from them, and counted as booty." VV.⁶⁻⁷. Isaiah's response in the name of YHWH. **6.** *Fear not!*—a characteristic phrase of the Biblical religion from the first book of Scripture (Gen. 15¹) to the last (Rev. 1¹⁷); it has occurred above in the mouth of Elijah and Elisha (I. 17¹³, II. 6¹⁶), and appears in Isaiah's address to Ahaz (Is. 7⁴). The Assyrian deputies are scornfully referred to as *the pages* (*na'ârê*, literally 'boys') of the king of Assyria, not with the ranking official title of 'ministers' (*e.g.*, v.⁵, etc.; EVV 'servants' for both words). **7.** *Lo, I am putting a spirit in him, and he will hear a rumour, and he will return to his land, and I will fell him with the sword in his land.* 'Spirit' here is the uncanny presentiment of evil, hardly personified; for similar use of the indefinite noun *cf.* Eze. 2², 3¹²⁻¹⁴, where trr. wrongly have 'the spirit.' Personification does appear in the vision, I. 22^{19ff.}; see Comm. *ad loc.* In the statement of this *rumour* there may be good historical reminiscence of the family's quarrels that brought about the tyrant's undoing (v.³⁷); but, rather, as is argued in the Additional Note, the rumour was that of Tirhakah's advance, v.^{9.5}

VV.⁸⁻³⁴. A second deputation from Sennacherib demanding surrender, vv.⁸⁻¹³, Hezekiah's prayer in the temple, vv.¹⁴⁻¹⁹, and Isaiah's oracle, vv.²⁰⁻³⁴. VV.^{8. 9a}. The changed conditions of Sennacherib's Palestinian campaign. **8.** The Rabshakeh's commission proving fruitless, he *returned and found the king of Assyria fighting against Libnah, for he heard that he had broken camp from Lachish.* This city had now been taken (*cf.* 18^{13ff.}). **9a.** The siege of Libnah (for which place

⁵ S. Smith, in exposition of the Esarhaddon Chronicle (*Bab. Hist. Inscriptions*, 8 ff., 14), suggests that 'wind,' as he would translate 'spirit' here is reminiscent of the great storm before which Esarhaddon's army fled in his sixth year (675 B.C.), and so argues for still greater confusion in the present story; but the word cannot in this connexion mean 'wind.'

cf. 8²²) was, however, interrupted, for the Assyrian *heard concerning Tirhakah king of Ethiopia* [Heb. *Cush*], *to wit, Lo, he has come forth to fight with thee.* Tirhakah (more correctly Thrkḥ, with the Egyptian and an Egyptian Aramaic inscription—see Note) was the last of the short-lived Ethiopian (XXVth) Dynasty, attaining the throne 688/7 B.C., himself a negroid, and nephew of his predecessor Shabataka. Years before his elevation to the throne he was in active military service. He fell and disappeared upon Ashurbanipal's conquest of Egypt in 670 B.C.⁶ The Biblical item, giving a military reason for Sennacherib's sudden desertion of his campaign, is interestingly paralleled by the abrupt conclusion of col. iii of the Taylor Prism.

9b. In consequence *he again sent envoys to Hezekiah, to the effect*—. 10. The message is more blasphemous against the Israelite God than in the former case, according to which Hezekiah was the 'deceiver' (18²⁹): *Let not thy God in whom thou trustest deceive thee!* It is assumed that he had learned of Isaiah's oracle. 11. *See, thou thyself hast heard what the kings of Assyria have done to all the lands in devastating them, and wilt thou be delivered?* There follow, after the satirical inquiry, 12a. *Did there deliver them the gods of the nations which my fathers destroyed?*, two lists of such conquered city-states: (1) 12b. *Gozan and Haran and Reseph and the Bnê-Eden, those in Telassar.* For the places see Kraeling, *Aram and Israel*, Dussaud, *TH* 464. For Gozan cf. 17⁶; an expedition thither is cited in the Eponym list for 809 B.C. For Haran, once home of the Abramids (Gen. 11^{27ff.}), the ancient 'Road-City' (Akk.), see BDD; Olmstead, *HA* 36 ff.; von Oppenheim, *Der Tell Halaf*, ch. 2; it had belonged to Assyria since ca. 1100 B.C. Reseph, Akk. Rašappa, appears in the Eponym list for the year 804; it is the modern Rašafa, NE of Palmyra (cf. Dussaud, pp. 253, etc.). Bnê-Eden (*n.b.* the survival of the clan-name) is abbreviation of Bnê-Beth-Eden, and the place identified with the Beth-Eden of Am. 1⁵, the Eden mentioned along with Haran in Eze. 27²³, and the Akk. Bit-Adini, the district S of Haran on the Euphrates. In the 'Political Ostrakon' published by Lidzbarski (*Altaram.*

⁶ See Petrie, *HE* 3, 294 ff.; Breasted, *HE* 554 ff.; Alt, *Israel u. Aegypten*, 80 f.; Meyer, *GA* 3, 47 ff.

Urkunden aus Assur, no. 1) there is given a list of transportations similar to the one here, and including Beth-Eden: "Prisoners brought forth Tiglath-pileser out of Bet-Awukkan, and prisoners brought forth Ululai (Shalmaneser) out of Beth-Eden, and prisoners brought forth Sargon out of Dur-Sin." See Dussaud, pp. 463 f., Forrer, *RA* 1, 136, and for Borsippa, the notable capital of the ancient district, E. Unger, *RA* 1, 402 ff. 'Telassar' can be analyzed into 'Tell-Ashur,' or the like; see *CIOT* 2, 12, and Kraeling, pp. 63 ff., who notes the ancient name Telesaura for the far-northerly Mar'ash (*cf.* Dussaud, *l.c.*). (2) **13.** *Where is the king of Hamath, and the king of Arpad?* The latter city, modern Tell-Erfād, NW of Aleppo, submitted to Tiglath-pileser in 740 B.C. The sequel, *and a king to the city of Sepharwaim, Hena and Iwwah*, is a gloss from 17³¹, with interpolation of an unknown Hena, and a different vocalization for Iwwah, *vs.* Awwites there.

VV.¹⁴⁻¹⁹. Hezekiah's receipt of the Assyrian demand, and his supplication to his God in the temple. **14.** *And Hezekiah received the letter from the hand of the envoys and read it: i.e.,* written despatches (the Heb. word is plural) brought by the delegation of v.⁹. For such usual imperial formality *cf.* a letter of Esarhaddon to Baalu, king of Tyre, which has been fragmentarily preserved, imposing a treaty with awful curses (*ARA* 2, §§587-91). Hezekiah acts as the priest of his people, as did Solomon before him (see on I. 8^{14ff.}), and ritually *went up to the house of YHWH, and spread it* (the letter) out before YHWH; the letter was doubtless on parchment, and written in Aramaic or Hebrew, since the king *read it*. **15.** He makes his prayer; *cf.* J. Begrich, *Der Psalm des Hiskia* (1926). The king is represented as in the immediate presence of the ark; there was a similar occasion, when David went in, and sat before YHWH, and prayed his prayer (2 Sam. 7^{18ff.}). Hezekiah's credal confession adds to that put in David's mouth (*ib.* v.²⁸): *Thou alone art the God* (the absolute Deity) *for all the kingdoms of the earth. Thou hast made the heavens and the earth.* The confession is followed by the prayer, vv.¹⁶⁻¹⁹. Assyria herself by the destruction of the hand-made idols of the peoples has proved the emptiness of heathenism. *Cf.* the challenging use of the divine title 'Living God,' Josh. 3¹⁰, 1 Sam. 17^{26. 36}. The deliverance of his people will be YHWH's triumph over

all his boasted rivals, the world *will know that thou, YHWH, art God alone*; cf. Ex. 9¹⁶, Is. 43^{10ff.}, etc.

VV.²⁰⁻³⁴. Isaiah's unbidden oracle to Hezekiah in divine answer to his prayer. Here as in the parallel account, v. 1, the king expected divine advice. For royal oracles in the Babylonian-Assyrian religion see Weber, *Die Literatur d. Babylonier u. Assyrer*, ch. 12; Jastrow, *Die Rel. Bab. u. Ass.*, ch. 19, esp. pp. 151 ff.; Zimmern, *Bab. Hymnen u. Gebete* (1905, 1911), I, 8; 2, 20 f.; for Egypt, Erman and Ranke, *Ägypten*, 467 ff.; and for Biblical correspondences Gunkel, *Einkl. in d. Psalmen*, 136 ff. Caution must be expressed against pushing the correspondences too far; in this ch. the 'oracle' is given by a non-ecclesiastical prophet, without divinatory rites. Cf. the immediate divine responses to private persons in the sanctuary: to Hannah at Shiloh, 1 Sam. 1; to the saint in his perplexity, Ps. 73¹⁷; to Paul by trance and vision in the temple, Acts 22^{17ff.}.


VV.^{21b-28}. An ode of derision.

21b. *Taunted thee, mocked thee hath she: the Virgin daughter
Sion,*

After thee shaken the head: the Daughter Jerusalem.

22 *Whom hast thou reviled and blasphemed: and against
whom raised the cry,*

*And lifted thine eyes aloft?—Against Israel's Holy
One!*

23. *By thy envoys thou hast taunted YHWH [so MSS;  Lord], and said:*

With the mass of my chariotry I: . . .

Have gone up to mountain tops: the recesses of Lebanon,

*And cut down the height of its cedars: the choice of its
firs,*

*And come to its farthest lodge: the forest of its garden-
land.*

24. *It is I who have dug and drunk: waters strange,
I who dry up with the soles of my feet: all the Nile-
arms of Egypt.*

25. *Hast thou not heard ? : From of old I wrought It,
In ancient days shaped It : now I have brought It on,
That thou be to crash into ruinous heaps : fortified cities,*
26. *With their citizens short of hand : dismayed and con-
founded,
Become as herb of the field : and green of the grass,
Growth of the roof-tops : and blasting before standing
corn.
Thy standing up (27) and thy sitting : and thy going
and coming I know.*
28. *Because thou hast raged against me : and thy tumult is
in mine ears,
So will I set my hook in thy nostrils : and my bridle in
thy lips,
And turn thee back by the road : whereon thou camest.*

The above translation represents the Heb. text, with exception of a word prefixed to v.²⁷, assumed to have fallen out through haplography, and with elision of a duplicate at end of v.²⁷, and *thy raging against me*. V.²³ is introduced with a prose *loquitur*. The second half-line of the same v. is evidently missing; it is supplied by G^L with 'I have wrought might.' For critical details see Notes. For metrical reconstructions and special studies see Haupt, *SBOT*, p. 278; W. Popper, *Parallelism in Isaiah*, Ch. 11-35 and 37, 22-35 (1923); Budde in *JTS* 35 (1934), 307 ff.; T. J. Meek, 'The Metrical Study of II Kings 19, 20-28,' *Crozer Quarterly Review*, 1941, 126 ff.

The ode is rough in quality, but strong and individual. It is similar in dramatic construction to Isaiah's taunt against Assyria (Is. 10^{5ff.}), but goes its own way in the theme of the divine fate which has given the Assyrian his temporary license, *ad majorem gloriam Dei*. For the 'shaping,' v.²⁵, used primarily of the artist's creation, cf. Gen. 2^{7ff.}, then of the artist's creative idea and purpose, cf. Jer. 18¹¹ (where EVV have 'devise'). The mysterious *it* of the purpose is paralleled in Is. 46¹¹, Jer. 33²; also see Note. The ode is doubtless contemporary to the brutal Assyrian power, and

with pertinent satire mocks its pride. V.²³ is echo of Assyrian inscriptions. Cf. Sargon's Cylinder Inscription (lines 10 ff.; *KB* 2, 40 f., *ARA* 2, §118—the latter followed here): “(Sargon, mighty hero) who opened up mighty mountain regions whose passes were difficult and countless, and who spied out their trails; who advanced over inaccessible paths, (in) steep and terrifying places”; this is followed by a list of his conquests, including “all of the desert as far as the River of Egypt”; and Sennacherib in the Taylor Prism (col. i, lines 66 ff.; *KB* 2, 86 f., *ARA* 2, §236): “In the midst of the high mountains I rode on horseback, where the terrain was difficult, and had my chariot drawn up with ropes; where it became too steep, I clambered up on foot like the wild-ox”; and Ashurbanipal, in the Rassam Cylinder (col. viii, 82 ff.; *KB* 2, 221 f.; *ARA* 2, §823): “(The armies) marched over distant trails, climbed high mountains, plunged through stretches of dense forests.” A few lines later on this inscription tells how “my soldiers dug for water (to quench) their thirst.” The boastful reference in v.²⁴ to ‘drying up the Nile-arms’ (the Egyptian word for the Delta channels is used) is actually stated by the Heb. with the imperfect tense and is not represented as an historical event by which the document may be dated. For illustration of the barbarous treatment of captives presented in v.²⁸ (with which cf. the symbolic expression, Is. 30²⁸) the relief of Esarhaddon's inscription at Senjirli depicts Tirhakah of Egypt (with his negroid features) and Baalu, king of Tyre, each bridled with a ring in his nose, and the attached cords in the conqueror's hand (F. von Luschan, *Ausgrabungen in Sendschirli*, pl. i; cf. p. 17); and according to 2 Ch. 33¹¹ the later Manasseh was ‘taken with hooks’ to Babylon.

VV.²⁹⁻³⁴. A further oracle of Isaiah's: the long desolation of the land an omen of deliverance. It is a literary question whether the passage is prose or poetry; the former view is adopted by Cheyne (on Is.), Kittel (Comm., *BH*), the latter by Stade, Šanda, Popper. There exists in the passage a balancing of parts, in general tetrameter form, but as compared with the ode above subject-matter and form are eminently prosaic. There may be compared the prose supplements added often to prophetic odes, e.g., at end of Is. 6 and 7

29. *And this the sign to thee : i.e., a sign whose ultimate fulfilment will prove the truth of the prediction ; cf. Is. 7^{10ff.}, and another Isaianic story, Is. 20. Eating this year the after-growth, and in the second year the re-growth, and in the third year sow and reap and plant vineyards and eat their fruit !* The comparative abundance of the *after-growth* in a year when there is no seeding of the fields is illustrated by the law for the sabbatic year, Lev. 25. The word translated *re-growth* is unique, a term for the automatic growth in the second year ; see Dalman, *A. u. S.*, 2, 203 f., giving an Arabic equivalent for the term. **30.** *And the salvage of the house of Judah which is left shall again root downwards and bear fruit upwards ;* **31.** *for from Jerusalem shall go forth a remnant, and a salvage from Mount Sion. The jealousy of YHWH 'Sebaoth' [plus with Kr., Is., VSS] shall effect this.* There follows an explicit amplification of v.²⁸ : **32.** *Therefore thus has spoken YHWH concerning the king of Assyria : He shall not come to this city, nor shoot there an arrow, nor confront it with shield, nor cast mound against it.* **33.** *By the road by which he comes [Is. has come] shall he return, and to this city he shall not come—oracle of YHWH.* **34.** *And I will shield this city to save it, for my sake and my servant David's sake.* This alleged prognostication that Sennacherib would not come to the city nor attack it is confirmed by the silence of his cylinder inscription. For *David's sake*, cf. I. 11^{12, 13}.

35. *And it came to pass in that night that the Angel of YHWH went forth and smote in the camp of Assyria 185,000. And when they (indefinite plural) got up in the morning, lo they (the Assyrians) were all dead corpses. Is., Ch. om. it came to pass in that night.* The time expression is indefinite=' on such and such a night ' ; cf. Gen. 19^{33, 35}, Jud. 3³⁰, 4²³, etc. Correspondingly the Herodotean legend given below puts the disaster in ' one night.' Ch. also exceptionally moderates the high figure : " there were destroyed every man of valour and captain and prince." The v. relates back to 18¹⁷, with its note of ' the great army ' accompanying the first Assyrian delegation in demand of surrender. The legendary character of the statement has been recognized since J. D. Michaelis (see Thenius for early discussion). There is the parallel Egyptian legend, based on ultimate historical fact without

doubt, cited by Herodotus, ii, 141 (repeated by Jos.) how Sennacherib with a great army of Arabians and Assyrians marched against Egypt. The forces of Sethos, the Egyptian priest-king, would not march with him. In his distress he had a night-vision of his god Hephæstos, who reassured him, "Myself will send you champions." The enemy came, and "one night a multitude of field-mice swarmed over the Assyrian camp and devoured their quivers," etc., so that "the enemy fled unarmed, and many fell." For the mouse as ancient symbol of the plague, and doubtless known as its carrier, cf. 1 Sam. 5^{6ff.}, 6^{1ff.}. Apollo Smintheus (σμίνθος, 'mouse') was god of the plague. For full text and translation of Herodotus see Rogers, *CP* 346 f., giving a large bibliography, as does also Kittel, *GVI* 2, 436. Procopius records the great plague that broke out at Pelusium on the Egyptian border in Justinian's reign; see Gibbon's extensive note on plagues, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, ch. 43, towards end. It is out of place, as e.g. with Keil, to regard the Herodotean legend as a fabulous development of the Biblical one; the two stories are a capital instance of the various development of popular legend based on historic fact. For the overwhelming suddenness of the stroke of a plague cf. the story of that in David's day, 2 Sam. 24^{15ff.}.

36. *And Sennacherib king of Assyria broke camp and went off, and he returned and dwelt in Nineveh.* **37.** *And it came to pass, as he was worshipping in the house of Nisrok his god, Adrammelek and Sareser [Kr., VSS, Is. plus his sons; cf. Ch.] smote him with the sword. And they escaped into the land of Ararat. And Esarhaddon his son reigned in his stead.* Until modern Assyriology this was the oldest record of Sennacherib's violent end.⁷ The fact is briefly and independently reported by Berossos, *via* Alexander Polyhistor and Eusebius: "He remained in power 18 years, and died by the hand of his son Ardumuzanus in an uprising," along with further information

⁷ A useful summary of texts from that quarter is given by Jirku, *AKAT* 180 ff. For special discussions see P. Schnabel, *Berossos*, 142 ff., with full critical treatment; Hall in *CAH* 3, 278, and Cook, *ib.*, 389 ff.; B. Meissner, 'Neue Nachrichten über die Ermordung Sannacheribs u. die Nachfolge Esarhaddons,' *Sb.*, Berlin Academy, 1932, 252 ff.; E. G. Kraeling, 'The Death of Sennacherib,' *JAOS* 53 (1933), 335 ff.; H. Hirschberg, *Studien zur Geschichte Esarhaddons*, Teil I (n. d.).

from Abydenus, who gives a confused account of the succession including Sennacherib, and concludes with the statement that, "Having subdued the Babylonians, he set up his son Asordanius (Esarhaddon) as king, withdrawing himself and proceeding to Assyria" (Eus., *Chronica*, i, 27, 25-29). Rogers gives the full pertinent text with translation (*CP* 347 f.). The name of Adrammelek has been preserved by Eusebius: "After him there ruled Nergilus, who was cut off by his son Adramelus. Adramelus was in his turn killed by Axerdis (Esarhaddon)." F. Hitzig suggested that Nergilus is to be combined with Biblical Sar'ešer as Nergal-sar-ušur; see *CIOT* 2, 15 f., with full bibliographical note. But an historical personage is obtained by Rost's identification (cited by Winckler and Haupt) with Nabū-sar-ušur, name of the eponym for the year of the assassination, 682 B.C. (*CP* 225; *ARA* 2, p. 438), which high official would then have been one of the conspirators. As for the murder the Babylonian Chronicle records that "Sennacherib king of Assyria was killed by his son" (*KB* 2, 280; *CP* 215). Cf. Nabonidus's inscription published by L. Messerschmidt (*MVG* 1896, 1, col. i, 35 ff.): "The king of Assyria, who during Marduk's wrath had worked destruction of the land, was struck down with a weapon by the son, the issue of his inwards" (for the remarkable equivalence of the last phrase with Heb. of 2 Ch. 32²¹ see Note). These records speak only of one son. However in the composite document presented by Luckenbill out of various prisms (*ARA* 2, §§500 ff.) there are references to 'my brothers,' who had wrought their deeds of violence (e.g., §§501, 506). Also the inscription published by Meissner (noted above) contains several references to the wicked rebels, 'my brothers.' He also pertinently suggests that the Nergilus and Adramelus of Eusebius were brothers, not father and son. Names of several of Sennacherib's sons are recorded, but none is identified with one of the murderers. Now, as noted above in the text, Ki. names two murderers, Ch., followed here by *Krê* and VSS, has introduced the appositive 'his sons' after their names. Rost has suggested correction of text to 'Adramelek his son and Sareser' (see Haupt. *ad loc.*, cf. *BH*); but there is no right to correct the text of an imperfect tradition, which is of singular merit in preserving the names of the

assassins. It is quite possible that the Chronicler followed a Babylonian tradition. For the names of the murderers see Note. As for the place of the murder, put by our record at Nineveh, there is dispute. The Rassam cylinder of Ashurbanipal (col. iv, 70 ff.) has an obscure reference to his grandfather Sennacherib at first sight suggesting his death at Babylon; see the varying translations in *KB* 2, 193, *ARA* 2, §795, A. Ungnad, *ZA* 1924, 50 f., and Meyer's extensive note (*GA* 3, 66), supporting location of the death at Nineveh. And Meissner (p. 261) finds it 'vielleicht wahrscheinlich' that the event occurred there. Winckler (*KAT* 85) and Šanda argue that the scene of the murder was Babylon, since Nisrok-Marduk, 'his god,' was worshipped there, not at Nineveh. But according to the Nabonidus inscription cited above, the ruthless Assyrian conqueror, "took the hand of Marduk, and brought him to Assyria" (col. i, 14 ff.); cf. also cols. viii, seq., concerning the bringing home of the exiled gods of Babylon, the restoration of Marduk's temple, etc. With allowance of the identification of Nisrok with Marduk as most likely, there may be an incorrectness here, and to relieve the difficulty other suggestions have been offered (see Note). Yet Esarhaddon frequently styles himself 'worshipper of Nabū and Marduk.' That the murderers and their large rebellious faction fled to 'Ararat' is supported by the Assyrian texts. In his first year Esarhaddon pursued the rebels into Ḫanigalbat (*KB* 2, 140 ff.; *ARA* 2, §504), i.e., the country of Malatia-Milid, W of Urtu-Ararat, which is the region of Lake Van. Polyhistor, in Eusebius, offers the parallel that Esarhaddon pursued the rebel army "to Byzantium and there shut it up."

Ch. 18. 1. שלש : Gr. e₂, Jos. = '4th.'—חוקיה : 4 MSS, Ch., חוקיהו, to be expected in the first occurrence, and so below, v. 9, etc., but with variant spellings in MSS and edd.; the full form on a contemporary Jerusalem ostrakon, Albr., *JPOS* 1926, 88 ff., Diringier, *IAE*, and so Sennacherib's vocalization, 'Hazakiau.'—2. אבי : caritative of אביה, and so 3 MSS here = Ch., and Gr. x y, Jos., Αβια; B A Αβου may represent Αβιου = orig. אביהו (St.). The element 'father' is freq. in *mn. f.*, see Noth, *IP* 15; it also occurs in S. Arab. names. The name occurs at I. 14³¹, 'Abiyam,' as masc.—4. וכריהו : Ch., וכריהו.—4. וכרת . . . וכרת . . . ושבר . . . הסיר : for the consecution see Note, 14⁷.—האשרה : Ch., האשרים, and so the pl. in VSS; but the sing. also at 17¹⁸, 21³, and to be retained here; cf. the foll. definite 'Nehushtan.'—4 MSS 'את נ' : וכרת נחש—

of which 𐤒, and 𐤔=נחש, are reduced forms.—ויקרא: impers. sing., as at I. 9¹³, and so properly JV; likewise with the pl. some VSS, e.g., 𐤔^L.—נחשתך: corrupt forms in Grr., e.g., B; some MSS=𐤒. For -ân as determinative ending (cf. S. Arab.) see D. Nielsen, *Ras Šamra Mythologie*, 17 ff., Montg., *JAOS* 58 (1938), 131. The one name involves both 'serpent' and 'brass,' the root of the former being variation of 𐤏𐤔, 'to hiss'; see Note, 17¹⁷.—5. [ב]ל: OGrr. om., reducing the eulogy.—ואשר היו לפניו: an evident gloss, *ad majorem gloriam*; *per contra*, n.b. 23²⁵.—6. לא [כר]: supported by Gr. MSS exc. one, vs. ולא of many MSS=𐤔^H et al.—יהוה: B† om.—7. והיה יהוה: it is easy to emend, with St., to ויהי, or ויהי ה, but the clause is subordinate to the foll. sentence; cf. Dr., *Tenses*, §133, and his note on Sam. I, 1¹².—8. ואת: 2 MSS deR., ויער=Grr., 𐤔^H, preferred by St., but the like phrase at 15¹⁶.—גבוליה: Grr., exc. z, as sing.—9. ויהי: 𐤔 𐤙 om.—10. 𐤔^L מלך, 𐤔; other VSS=וילכה, and so 10 MSS deR., *Suppl.*—11. ישראל: Grr., 𐤔^H 'Samaria,' preferred by St.; but 𐤒=17⁶.—ינהג: i.e., as from root 'to lead,' and so repetitive; read ונהג=VSS, EVV, and cf. Gen. 2¹⁵.—12. כנעריב: cf. the Elephantine Aḥīkar papp. with כנעריב (also 'ש'), giving fuller presentation of the Akk. *Sin-ahē-eriba*; Gr. e₂ Σενναχηρειβ, Jos., Σενναχηριβος; other Grr., -ειμ.—כל: Ch., Grr. om., Jos. has; vs. St., the omission is criticism of the absolute expression; but note Senn.'s item '46 cities.'—13. וישלח: Gr. and Lat. plus, 'messengers,' is epexegetical.—שלשים: Jos., 𐤔^L 300.—14. קצין: for the vocalization see GK §52, 1, and for the mng. cf. 16¹⁷.—אננות: generally interpreted from the participial form as 'supporters,' cf. EVV; Grr., εσθημενα; 𐤔^H 'posts'; 𐤔 𐤔 'thresholds'; 𐤙 'laminae'; Ehrl. gratuitously replaces with נגנות, referring to I. 10¹⁷, where however נגנים (but נגנות, 2 Ch. 23⁹).—15. רב כרים: the title also at Jer. 39³.¹³; רב כרים appears as high military title in Judah, 25¹⁹, while an inferior officer appears to be designated by it at I. 22⁹. For the present title see Montg., on Dan. 1³⁸.—רב עקה (so BH, other edd. as one word): Schrader (*CIOT*) argued for equivalence with alleged *rab-šak*, 'chief captain'; Bezold (*Glossar*, 252) renders primarily with 'Obermundschenk,' as proposed by Zimmern, and so Šanda, Procksch; cf. Pharaoh's butler, טשקה, Gen. 40¹.—[ב]תיל=Is.; Aramaizing for תיל, read by many MSS (deR., *Suppl.*).—ויעלו ויבאו ירושלם ויעלו ויבאו: absent in Is.; VSS, exc. 𐤔, om. the second half, a clumsy repetition; Heb. MSS variously om. one or the other (see deR.). With excision of 'Tartan' and 'Rab-saris' the pls. here and in v. 18, are to be reduced to the sing., with Is.—בתעלת: 𐤔 εν τω ὑδραγωγῳ, to which 𐤔^L pref. εν τη αναβασει=Sym., Quinta.—16. ויקראו אל המלך: Is. om., but the incident is dramatically in place.—אלהם: 𐤔 (=A 𐤔^H) as אליו=Is.—אליקים: the name on a Judæan bulla and seal, *IAE* 126, 247.—בן הלכיהו: 𐤔^L 𐤒 om.; the name on a Judæan seal, J. L. Starkey, *PEQ* 1936, Oct., pl. vi.—שנה: so edd. here, but

many MSS שבנא, as inf., v.³⁷, 19²=Is., the correct spelling. It is a frequent Palestinian name, also, as שבניה, שבניה, appearing on seals from Lachish, Tell en-Nasbeh and elsewhere; see *IAE* 169, 214, *PEQ* 1941, 46, Albr., *AJA* 1936, 159; the latter has well interpreted the first element of the name as 'return, pray'; cf. Note, 161.—אבך: the name on a seal, *IAE* 169.—19. [המלך] הנודל =Grr., but ש^H ✕.—20. אמרף: Is., exc. 18 MSS, incorrectly אמרפי (preferred by Delitzsch, Dillmann); εἶπας; σ^L σ^L και πας Ιουδα, built up, as Burn. notes, from σ^L εἶπας.—=Is.; 2 MSS ועתה =σ^L A al.; similar text variations below.—21. עתה: Is. om.—לך: the ethical dative, as at v.²⁴, is ignored by Is.—הקנה הרצון: Marti, on Is., argues that the figure of the broken reed was taken from Eze. 29^{6f}; but the figure of the reed was common (e.g., Mt. 11⁷).—22. תאמרון: coll. pl.; Is. as sing.=VSS, exc. T and Theodoret; for such indifferent use cf. cases in v.²⁷.—בירושלם: Is. om.—23. התעיר: Is., 6 Gr. MSS, C T; al. as pl.—את מלך איזור: Is. is redundant; Is. the ungrammatical 'א את ה'א; the phrase to be omitted, or 'מ' א' to be read; *BH* proposes here and at v.³¹ to read simply המלך.—24. פדת ארז עברי: the clumsy construct construction is defended by Burn.; but rather, with St., פ' has been introduced as an antiquarian note.—25. המקום הזה: Is., 'this land,' by conformation with the foll. phrase.—26. בן חלקיהו: Is., X om., prob. arbitrarily.—יהודית, ארמית: for the former word see Montg. on Dan. 2⁴. The two forms, 'aramaice,' 'iudaice,' are Aramaic; for the widespread use of the adverbial form see Duval, *Traité de grammaire syriaque*, 281.—27. אליהם: Is. avoids; הוא is demanded.—העל: read with Is. האל; the like change demanded in על [האשנים], where Is.=Ki.—תריהם: 3 MSS, Is., תריהם (see Note, 6²⁶); קר. צואקא.—שיניהם: Kt.: Lexx. point the noun as שין, but שין is preferable, cf. Akk. *šināti* (pl. as here). Note now the Ugaritic root *šyn* (Gordon, *Ugar. Handbook*, 3, 2154). קר. similar suppression of indelicate terms in 6²⁵. *N.b.* the remarkable rewriting in Ch.—28. וידבר: 6 MSS, Is., P om.—[המלך] דבר: 3 MSS 'ד, 4 MSS את דברי =Is., Grr. P; for omission of את cf. GK §117, a.—29. טירו: absent in Is.; ca. 30 MSS^{or} טירי (see deR.'s long note); of Grr. B†, and T=H; other VSS=קני, which is required, the vocable being legalistic.—30. רנתן העיר: for the construction see GK §121, a; 30 MSS, Is. om. את.—31. מלך איזור: Is. again with the ungrammatical 'א' ה'א.—32. [ארין] להם [וברמים]: at first sight the combination appears odd, and was so felt by T, translating with חלקין, as though for Heb. חלקים, 'fields,' which Meinh., Šanda adopt; but such a text corruption is most unlikely, and the combination of 'bread and wine' is quite in place.—חוקיהו . . . ארץ 3⁰: absent in Is., which adds 'Hezekiah' as subj. of יסית, *inf.*; the later Jews at least knew that Babylonia was not a land of the olive.—וית יצטר: 2 MSS ויצטר (=P); 1 MS om. וית, and so St.—כי: Is., נן, an intentional change (St.).—34. אלהי *bis*: Grr. (exc. σ^L), ש^H as

sing.—הנע ועוה: the nouns, lacking here in C C^L and in Is., appear to have been introduced from 19¹³ where Grr. and Is. read them. C developed the nouns into verbal expression, playing on the roots: "Has he not dispersed and carried them captive?" —כי: Bf=Is., ובי.—הצילו את שטרון מירי-ובי: as noted above Klost. rewrites the prefixed plus of OGrr. with וואה אלהי ארץ ש', generally accepted by scholars, e.g., Kit., Burn., St., Šanda, BH, Eissf. For Rahlfs's criticism see SS 3, 278; Orlinsky's reply (*JQR* 30 [1939], 46) on score of his objection to 'the land of (Samaria)' is valid. But the v. is an accretion, which lent itself to further manipulation by Lucian.—35. הארצות: 1 MS, Is. +האלה—unnecessary (St.).—אשר הצילו את ארצם: C^L with sing. verb, improving the ungrammatical $\tau\upsilon\varsigma . . . \sigma\iota$ of C .—36. והחרישו: read ונתק' with Is.—העם: Grr., Is. om., and so Orlinsky, *ib.*, 47; but 'the people' has definite political sense.—37. *N.b.* the formal repetition of the full titulurs.

Ch. 19. 1. Duhm regards the v. as intruded conformation with vv.^{14f.}, but note the appointment of priests in the commission.—2. After 'Shebna the scribe' Gr. MS b' (HP 19) inserts κ. τὸν Σαβηνα κ. τ. Σουμμαιτησοῦμαι κ. τ. Μακραππε τ. γεροντα, which Lagarde adopted in his Lucianic text, for which Rahlfs (SS 3, 25) criticizes his lack of judgment; for attempts at explanation see Burn., Haupt.—ישעתו הנביא בן אמיץ: Is. correctly 'הנ' C^L here; the patronymic need not be secondary, vs. St.; the title may be, since it fails in the rest of the ch. The father's name occurs on a seal (*IAE* 235).—3. לנה: [ל] לנה: for the form see GK §69, m; C C^L understand 'לנה', with Hos. 13¹³ in mind.—4. כל: 71 MSS, C^L MS A, Is. om.—א' אלהים חי: [=v.¹⁶]; otherwise א' חיים: C euphemistically, 'the people of God.'—8. לבנה: Grr., Λοβνα, Λομνα, cases of phonetic dissimilation; cf. Grr. 8²².—9. אל תהרקה: for the prep. 3 MSS, Kt.^{Or}, Is. correctly על. For the name Hex. Θαρακα is the closest Gr. transcription. *Thrk* is demanded, and so תהרקא appears in an Eg. tomb inscr. (followed with (?), also naming Necho and Psammaticchos), published by Giron in *Ancient Egypt*, pt. 2 (1923), 38 ff.; cf. Akk. *Tarku*; the nearest Gr. rendering is that of Strabo, Τερακων (i, 61).—וישיא: MS L properly pref. a *pishkah*; Is. erroneously, וישמע, cf. St.—10. לאמר . . . נה: C (C^L ✕) om., by parablepsis. acc. to Burn.; St. accepts the omission as original, arguing that in this case also a letter was sent; but this may have been the ground for the Gr. elision; diplomatic dispatches always have their oral presentation.—11. להחרימם: the root should be changed to חרב, 'to devastate,' as in v.¹⁷, with Joüon, Šanda; the Assyrians did not put conquered lands under the ban; see GB for cases of confusion of the two roots. The contrary suggestion to revise the verb in v.¹⁷ to חרב is amiss; see St. The suffix is grammatically incorrect, but *ad sensum*.—12. שתרו: 4 MSS, Is., השח(ו)תו.—הלאשר: Is., תלשי; Hex. texts alone transliterate correctly. All the proper names are

generally abused by the Grr. *N.b.* the use of preceding אשר like Akk. *ša*.—13. ומלך לעיר ספרוים הנע ועיה. the three city-names are secondary, and then prefixed with a gloss = 'a king to each city.' For לעיר Dussaud (*TH* 236) suggests rdg. לעש (of the Zakar inscr.), and is followed by Procksch on Is. See further Rosenthal's extensive note in his *Aram. Forschung*, 9, n. 3.—14. ויקראם . . . הכפרים . . . : VSS variously correct to consistent sings. or pls., as do most modern critics; the pl., also at 20¹², was collective, then approached the notion of the sing.; cf. Lat. 'litteræ'.—15. "ויהפלה ה' לפני י" om.—to avoid ascription of such a sacred function to the king?—יהוה: Is. + צבאות = $\mathfrak{S}^L \mathfrak{S}$.—16. דברי: Is. pref. כל = $\mathfrak{T} \mathfrak{S} \mathfrak{P}$.—עֲלֵהוּ: read with 6 MSS, Is., עֲלֵה = VSS.—לחורף: \mathfrak{T} the same variation as at v.⁴.—17. ואת ארצם. \mathfrak{S} om. (\mathfrak{S}^L Hex., 'and all their land'), and so St., but his interpretation of the preceding verb here and in v.¹¹ appears inconsistent.—18. ונתנו: read נתון with Is.—אלהים: Is. om.—20. [כתהרב]: read על with MSS^{or}.—שמעתי: Is. om.—21. בתולה בת ציון. for the accumulated constructs see GK §130, e.—22. ועל טי הרימות קול: St. and Haupt variously attempt to ease the overburdened metre.—23. מלאבין: Is., עבדוך = \mathfrak{P} .—14 MSS the original יהוה, and so MSS in Is.—ברכב: read ברכ with very many MSS, K_r., and all VSS.—אני: $\mathfrak{S}^L + \epsilon\pi\omicron\upsilon\eta\sigma\alpha \delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\mu\iota\nu =$ עשיתי חיל, as proposed by Graetz, accepted by St., *al.*, and by Haupt with rearrangement of the whole metrical v.; against the addition is the general unreliability of \mathfrak{S}^L . *N.b.* the emphatic ego here and in v.²⁴.—ואבואה, ואברה: VSS, exc. \mathfrak{T} , as of past time, and so critics generally correct to 'וא', 'א'; cf. ואחרב, v.²⁴, where the same change is proposed; but the lively variation of pf. and impf. may not be ignored.—מבחרו: as in the doubtful passage, 3¹⁹; Is., כבקר, and so 6 MSS deR. here, which is to be accepted.—[קצה]: 1 MS, Is., מרום = $\mathfrak{S} \mathfrak{P}$; Grr. (exc. B, *μεσον*), *μερος* = \mathfrak{S}^H ; for the poetic phrase cf. Giesebrecht's correction of ארחם, Jer. 9¹, to אהרון ג'.—24. קרתי: B† = $\epsilon\psi\upsilon\zeta\alpha = \mathfrak{C}$, 'refreshed myself,' as from root קרר; *al.* altered this into $\epsilon\phi\upsilon\lambda\alpha\zeta\alpha = \mathfrak{S}^H$, which also notes Aq.'s rendering with 'I cut.' *N.b.* the wild rendering of the v. in Gr. of Is.—ורים: Is. om.; $\mathfrak{S} \mathfrak{P}$ properly, *ἀλλότρια*, 'alienae.'—כל יארי מצור: \mathfrak{S}^L ignores כל (as exaggeration?); for ג', $\mathfrak{S} \mathfrak{S}^H$ *περιοχος*, 'circumference'; \mathfrak{S}^L *συνεχεις*, 'continuous'; \mathfrak{S}^H *uššānā*, 'strength'; Sym., 'dense (rivers)'; $\mathfrak{T} \mathfrak{S}$ 'deep (rivers)'; \mathfrak{P} '(aquis) clausas'; AV 'besieged places.' The identification with 'Egypt' first appears in Kimchi, noting that 'some interpreters' have so understood it, and among modern VSS was first accepted by GV, followed by RVV JV. The same phrase appears in Is. 19⁶, as יארי מצרים, cf. Am. 8⁸, 9⁵, while Mic. 7¹² geographically contrasts Ashur and Masor. The latter word is paronomasia on the place-name (cf. בבל and בבל, Gen. 11⁹), Egypt possessing its fortified front against Asia since antiquity; see Breasted, *HE* 447.—25. קדם . . . הלא: $\mathfrak{S} \mathfrak{C} (\mathfrak{S}^H \times)$ om.—אתה: the fem. here and in the

foll. pronom. suffixes as indefinite neuter is paralleled in Ex. 10¹¹, Is. 22¹¹, 30⁸, Jer. 33² (on which see Graf in his Comm.); see GK §105, p, and *cf.* Note, 24³.—וַיִּצְרְחֵהָ] Grr., Aq., שׁ וּמ om., and so modern critics generally; but the consecution is that of parallelism, not of sequence, and וּמ may stand.—עָתָה : 1 MS וַיִּעָתָה=עָתָה שׁ וּמ.—וַיִּתְּהָ : the tr. above follows AV RV; RVam “that it should be thine”; JV, “yea, it is done,” after the Grr.=וַיִּתְּהָ. These trr. indicate the difficulty of interpretation. Poole notes Maius, citing scholars interpreting as of 2d pers., and so, *e.g.*, Then.; Cheyne (on Is.), Burn.: “that thou becamest”; St., Šanda elide as ‘metrically redundant.’ Popper would rewrite. The interpretation as of 3d pers. might be kept with the preceding indefinite ‘it’ as subject, *cf.* a similar case, 24³. The pointing of אִל is to be kept as jussive of purpose; *cf.* Dr., *Tenses*, §63, and the Arabic use of *fa* with subjunctive, *cf.* Wright, *Arab. Gram.*, 2, §15 (d).—לְהִשָּׂאוֹת : a remarkable punctuation; read with Is. לְהִשָּׂאוֹת.—Inversion of the foll. accusatives is expected. BH suggests omission of נָצִים, ‘metri causa.’—26. הָיוּ וַיִּבְשׂוּ : Is., הָיוּ וַיִּבְשׂוּ ; either form is possible.—ירֶק.—Dalman, *A.u.S.*, 2, 345, explains as ‘wild, edible vegetables.’—שָׂדֵה : Is., שָׂדֵה ; the latter elsewhere = ‘plantation,’ exc. at 23⁴, where the word is used as here in the sense of ‘burning, blasting.’—לִפְנֵי קָטָה : ‘before standing corn,’ as at Ex. 22⁵, etc.; VSS treat it as a verb. For proposed corrections see Burn., St., Haupt; *e.g.*, לִפְנֵי קָהָה (Haupt after Orelli), לִפְנֵי קָרִים ‘before the east wind’ (Then., Kit., Šanda, Popper). Quinta (cited by שׁ¹¹) has ‘before thy standing up,’ which suggested to Wellh. (*Comp.*, 292, n. 1) the rdg. לִפְנֵי קָהָה, to be prefixed to v.²⁷, with the resultant parallelism of ‘standing up’ and ‘sitting down,’ a correction largely accepted, *e.g.*, by Burn., Cheyne, St., Eissf. There remains the problem of the vacancy at end of v.²⁶, which St. leaves empty, while Haupt retains the text. Šanda, retaining that passage, avoids repetition of almost identical phrases by merely inserting at beginning of v.²⁷ קָהָה, which correction is given in tr. above.—27. וְאֵת הַתְּרִיגוֹ אֵלַי : the phrase has its duplicate immediately following in v.²⁸; St. keeps the text here (eliding וְאֵת), elides the duplicate; Šanda, BH, Eissf. make the reverse revision, which is preferable.—אֵלַי : 3 MSS עָלַי, which is demanded, and so in v.²⁸.—28. שְׂאֵנֶךָ : VSS = ‘thy haughtiness,’ RVV ‘arrogancy,’ marg., ‘careless ease’: AV JV ‘thy tumult’ (*cf.* FV) = שְׂאֵנֶךָ, and this correction of text has been generally accepted since Benz.—עִלָּה : Budde, St., Procksch cancel for metre’s sake, Popper transfers to prec. hemistich.—29. נִפְיָה : *cf.* Lev. 25⁵, 11.—כַּחֲשׁ : Is., כַּחֲשׁ ; the word a unicum.—וְרֵעֵי וְקִצְרוֹ וְנִשְׁעוּ : Hex. as nouns, hence possibility of original inf. abs. forms; but *n.b.* foll. וַאֲבָלוּ, where indeed Is. Kt. has וַאֲבָלוּ, but this in conformation with אֲבָלוּ near the beginning of v.—31. יְהוּה : Is. + עֲבָאֵת, which Ix. demands here, and so all VSS, exc. Gr. g, E.—32. [מִלֵּךְ] : אֵל is again demanded.—33. וַיָּבֵא : 15 MSS Ken., deR., Is., וַיָּבֵא = VSS, EVV.

and this appears to be demanded by the sequel, v.³⁵; but the poem is independent of the prose sequel, and Senn.'s coming is regarded as in the future, *cf.* v.³².—**34.** [העיר] : אל : read על with MSS, Is.—**34.** לַחַיִּים : OGr. om., ⚡^H ✱; it does not appear in the loose repetition, 20⁶; Haupt's metrical argument for its rejection is not of force in the tetrameter line.—**35.** וַיְהִי בַלַּיְלָה הַהוּא : Is. om.; B ⚡ κ. ἐγένετο νυκτος (*al.*, κ. ἐγ. εως νυκτος); the Gr.=Engl. 'of a night'; see Comm., and *cf.* Orlinsky's extensive note, *JQR* 30 (1939), 43.—עַמּוּנֵיהֶם : 34 MSS, Is. plus conj.=⚡.—**36.** וַיִּבֶן וַיִּלֶךְ : as the subj. should have followed the first verb, St. elides these verbs (*cf.* Ch.); ⚡ relieves the trouble with the pl. But with the common lack of explicitness as to subject the writer may have inserted it supplementarily.—וְהָיָה : omission in ⚡ is no authority for correction, *vs.* St., who then reads below וְהָיָה נִינְוָה, "and he returned to Nineveh." All these verbs are original in the text, and are not to be elided.—**37.** נִכְרַךְ : identification with מְרִידָה was made by Cheyne in *SBOT Is*, 114 f., Winckler (*KAT* 85), *al.*; the intentional alteration is similar to that in the names 'Shadrach<Marduk,' and 'Abed-nego<Abed-Nebo,' Dan. 1⁷. Other identifications have been proposed: Nusku, Nin-rag (see Cheyne, Haupt, Procksch), Nimurtu (Ungnad, *OLz.*, 1917, 359). Legend may well have identified the god of the temple with Marduk; the particular Ass. deities are not known to the Canon.—אֲדַרְמֶלֶךְ : as a divine name at 17³¹ (but see Comm. for correction to אֲדַרְמֶלֶךְ; Johns, Winckler (*KAT* 84, n. 2), Šanda suggest אֲרַדְמַלִּיק, 'Arad-malik,' *cf.* 'Arad-ellil,' name of one of Senn.'s sons; but Eusebius's 'Adramelus' supports ⚡.—שַׂרְאֶרְ-: the name as element appears in *n. pr.*, Bethel-sar-ešer, Zech. 7² (see GB 792b). This name has plus בְּנֵי in ⚡, 46 MSS Kt. (Ken., deR.), Is.=VSS. Ch. for 'his sons' has בְּנֵי אֲרַדְמַלִּיק, 'some offsprings of his bowels,' with which *cf.* the phrase in the Nabonidus cylinder cited in Comm. for the murderer, *māru šit libbišu*, repeating a common idiom.—אַרְרַט : Gr., 'Ararat,' ⚡^H 'Armenia' = Gr. of Is.; ⚡ 'Ḳardu,' *cf.* Gr. 'Kordylene'—'Kurd-land.'—אַרְרַטְוֶן : MSS and edd. vary in writing the name here and in Ezr. 4² as one word (so Ginsb.), or two (so L in *BH*); see Bär's note. The name now appears more exactly in Elephantine papp., אַסְרַדוֹנוֹן; it is rendered with 'Sacherdonos' in Tob. 1²¹.

Ch. 20¹⁻¹⁹. Hezekiah's illness, and the attendant marvels and oracles effected by the prophet Isaiah. || Is. 38, 39; *cf.* 2 Ch. 32²⁴⁻²⁶. **1.** Upon the king's evidently mortal illness Isaiah announces to him by the word of YHWH his coming decease, and bids him: *Order thy household, i.e., make thy testament.* **2.** The king *turned his face to the wall*: for private communion with his God (the same phrase in another connexion, I. 21⁴); ⚡ interprets 'to the wall of the temple,' and so

Kimchi. **3.** He recalls his merits before God. The *perfect heart* (so EVV; JV *whole heart*) may well be translated 'devoted heart,' the root of the adjective being that of the Muslim word *Islam*. *And Hezekiah wept with a great weeping*: according to Jos., the Talmud (Then., p. xxxii), and some later comm. (see Poole) the chief object of his grief was that he had no heir, Manasseh reaching the throne *at* 12 years, and so born subsequently to this event. VV.⁴⁻⁸. There occurs the divine change of mind, for "the prayer of a righteous man availeth much" (Jam. 5¹⁶). **4.** *And it came to pass, Isaiah had not gone out to [=GV EVV; FV JV out of] the middle court [with K_r; Kt. city]—*: for the variations of text and construction see Note. The middle court would be the complex of palace and temple; cf. I. 7⁸, and see Smith, *Jerusalem*, 2, 256 ff. The Heb. allows either construction for the object of 'going out'; in any case the point is the immediacy of the divine oracle; Is. omits this local item. —*and the word of YHWH came to him, to wit*: **5.** *Return, and say to Hezekiah, the prince of my people [with use of the older title, which Is. om.]: Thus has spoken YHWH, the God of David thy father: I have heard thy prayer, seen thy tears. Lo, I am healing thee. On the third day (the day after the morrow) thou shalt go up to the house of YHWH.* Hezekiah's affliction with an ulcer had debarred him from the temple. The reminiscence of David, repeated in v.⁶, is characteristic of Ki. (e.g., I. 3⁶), is absent in Is. **6a.** *And I will add to thy days fifteen years*: for the figure see Comm. on 18¹³. **6b.** The promise of the rescue of the king and *this city from the palm of the king of Assyria*, with repetition of 19³⁴, is obviously secondary. There is hardly reason, with Stade, to regard vv.^{5b. 6} as metrical. **7.** *And Isaiah said: Take [pl. verb] a cake of figs; and they took and applied it to the boil; and he recovered.* According to the story Isaiah is in the line of Elisha (4^{8ff.}, 5); Procksch *cf.* the medical allusions in Is., e.g., 1^{5f.}, 3¹⁷. For discussion of the disease see Ebstein, *Die Medizin im A.T.*, 99 ff. The Heb. word for *cake* appears in a veterinarian recipe for a horse-plaster in an Ugaritic text, 'a plaster of dried raisins' (see Note). In Is. as sequel to the long metrical "Writing of Hezekiah king of Judah, when he had been sick, and was recovered of his sickness," there follows the brief statement

of Isaiah's recipe, an intruded note indeed! Ch. om. all reference to the medication.

VV.⁸⁻¹¹. The marvel of the sun-dial for Hezekiah's reassurance. This intruding story presents a later legend in the Isaianic cycle. The many-sided Isaiah appears here as a miracle-worker, like the earlier prophets, or, according to one school of interpretation, as an astronomer. The passage is indeed a belated postscript to the earlier statement that Hezekiah 'recovered.' Is. contains a much abbreviated form, leaving out the alternatives offered to the king in vv.^{9ff.} Ch., v.²⁴, reports only that Hezekiah was sick, prayed to YHWH, who "spoke to him, and gave him a sign." 8. Hezekiah inquires of Isaiah: *Is there not a sign that YHWH will heal me, and I shall go upon the third day into the house of YHWH?* 9. *And Isaiah said: This is the sign for thee from YHWH, that YHWH will do this thing that he has spoken: Shall the shadow go on ten degrees, or shall it turn back ten degrees?* 10. *And Hezekiah said: It is an easy thing for the shadow to extend ten degrees; not so, the shadow shall turn backwards ten degrees.* 11. *And the prophet Isaiah called on YHWH, and he turned back the shadow in the degrees (=dial) . . . backwards ten degrees.* The four untranslated words mean by which it went down in the degrees of Ahaz, but the subject of the fem. verb. for 'went down' cannot be the masc. noun for 'shadow'; see Note, arguing for interpolation from Is. We have here the only reference in the Bible to a horologe. Herodotus asserts that dial and gnomon came from Babylonia (ii, 109); the reference to Ahaz's instrument might connect with that king's other innovations from Assyria (16^{10ff.}). For the Babylonian instrument see Meissner, *Bab. u. Ass.*, 2, 359; for the Egyptian, E. J. Pilcher, 'Portable Sundial from Gezer,' *QS* 1923, 85 ff., with full bibliography, and presenting a small portable sun-dial of Egyptian make of the first half of the 15th century B.C. found at Gezer; cf. Gressmann, *ATB* 2, 39, and Abb. 110. For recent discoveries of such sun-dials may be noted the presentations by A. E. Mader, *JPOS* 1929, 122 ff.; H. Ingholt, *Berytus*, 3 (1936), 112 ff.; R. N. and M. L. Myall, *Sundials* (1938), give an admirable survey of the subject. For the *degrees* (the word is the same as *stairs*, 9¹³) Jos. thinks of the stairs of Hezekiah's palace, upon which

the sun's rays could have moved as upon a rough-and-ready sun-dial. **Ⓣ** uses a technical term, אבן שׁעִיָּה, 'hour-stone,' followed by **Ⓜ** with 'horologium.' An upright pillar for the gnomon surrounded with a dial (like the use of the Egyptian obelisk brought to Rome by Augustus) would have served the purpose. For the word 'step/stairs' thus technically used, *cf.* Lat. 'gradus,' Engl., 'degrees.' The king is pictured as viewing the afternoon phenomenon of the sun's shadow stretching out; the parallel in Ch. states that "the sun went down." For presentation of exegetical interpretations of this marvel, see Keil, and Dillmann on Is.; defenders of the alleged phenomenon have tried to connect it with known eclipses, so Bosanquet, for Jan. 11, 689 B.C., Mahler, for June 17, 679; *cf.* Thenius, *ad loc.*; Rawlinson, *Comm.*; Pinches, *DB* 4, 627 f. Delitzsch, on Is., holds that there was no change in the sun, only a miraculous optical illusion for Hezekiah's eyes. But to the naïve mind the claimed miracle was not impossible, *cf.* Josh. 10^{12ff.}

VV.¹²⁻¹⁹. The congratulatory embassy from the king of Babylon, Hezekiah's grandiose reception of it, and Isaiah's rebuke of him with dire prophecy. The section is a notable example of the construction of many of these prophetic stories; it is based on an historic fact, while issuing in an apocryphal sequel. For Berodach-baladan, as the name is spelt here by current phonetic variation, Merodach-baladan of Is., the pugnacious opponent of Assyria, Marduk-apal-iddina, see the Histories cited in Additional Note, n. 1; as generally accepted, this diplomatic embassy may be placed *ca.* 705 B.C. The story gives a glimpse into the widespread diplomacy of the rebel movement. The king's father's name is given as Baladan; in an inscription of Tiglath-pileser's the father is named Yakin (*ARA* 1, §794); the name here may be an assumed patronymic to connect the king with his famous predecessor of the same name, towards 1500 B.C.; *cf.* R. P. Dougherty, *The Sealand of Ancient Arabia* (1932), 44 f. **12.** The Babylonian king courteously sent a letter and a present to Hezekiah, for he had heard that Hezekiah was sick. **13.** And Hezekiah rejoiced over them [*i.e.*, the envoys; so with Is.; **Ⓜ** here listened to them], and he showed them all [Is. om.] his store-house, the silver and the gold and the spices and the oil of aroma, and his

armoury, and all that was found in his treasures, with the extravagant sequel that he showed them everything in his house and in all his dominion. For the oil of aroma (*cf.* EVV) see Note; for the spices *cf.* the similar element of Solomon's wealth according to I. 10²⁵. The items well illustrate the Arabian trade, in which Hezekiah shared with profit; *cf.* the tradition of his wealth in 2 Ch. 32^{27ff.}. On Merodach-baladan's concern in that trade see Dougherty, as cited above. The two widely separated kingdoms circumvented Assyria's control by direct intercourse through the Arabian deserts.

14-16. The courteous inquiry and response between Isaiah and his king concerning this diplomatic adventure is followed by a *word of YHWH*, that (17) *all that is in thy house and that thy fathers have stored up unto this day shall be carried to Babylon, there shall not be left a thing—YHWH has spoken.*

18. *And of thy sons who shall issue from thee [H+repetitive whom thou shalt beget] there shall be taken, and they shall become eunuchs [with VSS, except T officers=JV] in the palace of the king of Babylon.* The prophet is correctly exhibited as opponent of such international alliances. The prediction is apocryphal, but the composition may not be dated much later than 597 B.C., when Jehoiachin and the royal family were carried off to Babylon, as there is no reference to the general exile. **19.** *And Hezekiah said to Isaiah: Good is the word of YHWH that thou hast spoken. And he said: Is it not [sic H], if peace and security be in my days?* Two independent responses of the king are here recorded, the first one of resignation, the second of self-congratulation. A tradition of OGr. omitted v.^b, and so since Duhm it has been generally cancelled as a late addition. But why such an obscure interpolation? The interrogative particle may be understood to mean, *If only peace and security be in my days!* The word translated *security* (EVV *truth*) refers to the divine faithfulness; *cf.* Ps. 132¹¹, etc. For such postponement of calamity for merit's sake *cf.* 22^{18ff.}, I. 21^{27ff.}.

VV.^{20, 21}. The end of Hezekiah's reign, and summary. *Cf.* 2 Ch. 32^{32, 33}. **20.** *And the rest of the acts of Hezekiah, and all his might, and how he made the pool and the conduit, and brought the water into the city, are they not written in the book of the chronicles of the kings of Judah?* The royal *might* in this case is illustrated by 18^{7, 8}. For the excavation of the Siloam tunnel

bringing the water of the Gihon spring, the 'Ain Sitti Maryam, on the east side of David's City to the inner pool of Siloam, *cf.* Ch. v.³⁰: " (He) stopped the upper source of the water of Gihon and graded [so the Akk. correspondent of the root] it down to the west of David's City." The conduit was named Shilôah (root = 'mission,' 'emission'); the name applied originally to the older conduit that ran around the Ophel to a pool to the south, appearing in Is. 7³. The reservoir at its outlet is called the Pool of Shelah in Neh. 3¹⁵, in the Gr. as Siloam, as also in the N.T. Ben Sira has a reminiscence of this construction, that it was worked with brass (48¹⁷, see the Heb. text). The contemporary monumental record is the unique Siloam inscription, describing the remarkable feat of the operation of the tunnel from opposite ends with successful junction, so that " the water flowed from the source [the same word as in Ch.] to the pool [the word as here] for 1200 cubits [approximately 1775 ft.]." For this famous inscription see Driver, *Samuel*, pp. viii *seq.*, Cooke, *NSI* no 2; Lidzb., *HNE* 439; and *AT* 9; in tr. Barton, *AB* 476, *et al.*; and for full discussion, Smith, *Jerusalem*, I, 101 ff.; Vincent, *Jérusalem Antique*, I, 134 ff. For a review of Palestinian hydrography see Abel, *GP* I, ch. 5. For similar operations *cf.* the deep tunnel (29 m. in depth) to a spring underlying Gezer (see R. A. S. Macalister, *Gezer*, I, 256 ff., and pl. 52, *cf.* Gressmann, *ATB* 2, 177, and Abb. 635), and a like tunnel to an underground spring bored by workers from opposite ends at Megiddo (Breasted, *The Oriental Institute*, 1933, 255 ff.). There may be compared the Moabite Mesha's interest in such water-works (ll. 22 ff. of his inscription). For a similar contemporary operation of great magnitude is to be noted the 'Sennacherib Canal,' as the royal author called it, a 30-mile long conduit to Nineveh (*ARA* 2, §§330-43), the remains of which great work were uncovered and announced by H. Frankfort (*ILN*, Aug. 1934, 294 ff. with 8 plates); see now T. Jacobsen and Seton Lloyd, *Sennacherib's Aqueduct at Jerwan, Or. Inst. Publ.*, 24 (1935). In connexion with Is. 22^{9a}, recording the scurry for the fortification of Jerusalem against an attacking army, with report of attempted water-works, it would appear that this new Siloam tunnel was subsequent to the year 701.

21. For fuller variants as to the burial, *e.g.*, Ch., see Note.

1. **לִבְיָדָה** : the verb is used in sense of the parallel Arabic root, *wšy*, e.g., *wašiyatun*, 'testament.'—2. **וַיִּשָּׁב** : Is. + הוֹקִיחוּ = 𐤇𐤍𐤁. — **אֵת פְּנֵיו** : B A, 𐤇𐤍 text, om. ; St. follows suit with change of the prec. verb to **וַיִּשָּׁב** ; but see Comm.—3. **אֵת אִשְׁרָה** [הַתְּהַלְכָתִי] : for the adverbial character see examples given by C. Gaenssle on the rel. particle as 'a vague medium of relation,' *AJSL* 31, 46 ff.—**לִבְנֵי** : Is., **לֵב**, but the phrase **לִבְנֵי שֵׁלֶם** also elsewhere.—4. **יָצָא** : as followed with acc. of direction cf. Gen. 27³, etc., with acc. of object, Gen. 44⁴, etc.—**הָעִיר** : 14 MSS, **קָצֵר** = VSS, to be accepted ; for full treatment of the latter word see Orłinsky, *JAOS* 59 (1939), 22 ff. ; cf. *JQR* 30 (1939), 34 ff. For use of the article in **הַתְּהַלְכָה** cf. I. 7⁸. Is. om. this local note, along with a briefer text for vv. 4-6.—5. **וְאֵת הָעִיר הַזֹּאת** : the phrase is *de trop*, is one layer in the stratification of the v., terminating in the citation of 19³⁴.—6. **כִּי** and **וַיִּשָּׁב** : **קָצֵרוּ** || **יִשְׁאוּ** || (Grr., 𐤇𐤍 𐤇 here = **קָצֵרוּ**) ; **וַיִּקְחוּ** : 𐤇, Is. om. ; **וַיִּמְרְחוּ** || **וַיִּשְׁמְנוּ** (the latter a technical term, 'to plaster') ; 𐤇, Is. om. ; **וַיִּקְחוּ** || **וַיִּמְרְחוּ** (= 𐤇 𐤇 here).—7. **דְּבַלַת הָאֵינִים** : cf. the Ugaritic parallel, *dblt ynt wšmqm ytnm*, 'an old plaster and old raisins,' Gordon, *Ugar. Handbook*, 2, 55 : 28.—8. **מָה אֵינִי** : "what sign (is there)?" ; cf. **מָה בָצַע**, Gen. 37²⁶ ; but quite possibly "is there not?" cf. Arab. *mā*, 'not,' and see Lexx. for corresponding use in Heb. Haupt also notes the Arab. use of the construct with a foll. full sentence, for which see Wright, *Arab. Gr.*, 2, §78.—9. **לִי** : Grr. om., exc. 𐤇.—**הֲלֵךְ** : the VSS as though interrog. future = **הֲלֵךְ**, and so Rashi, Kimchi, modern VSS ; Jos. follows Is.'s omission of alternatives, and renders with "the sun has advanced, shall it return?" Modern comm. generally make that correction (cf. *BH*) ; St. is dubious, holding that the verb "may reflect an older form of the story," along with suggested corrections from Is. ; Meinhold om. the passage, and tries to reconstruct on basis of Is. But the text can be retained by rdg. **הֲלֵךְ**, the abs. inf. being used interrogatively.—10. **אִשְׁרָה יִרְדָּה בְּמַעְלוֹת אִשְׁרָה** : the clause appears along with a complicated expansion in Is., where appears at the end, **וְהַשֶּׁמֶשׁ עָשָׂר מַעְלוֹת בְּמַעְלוֹת אִשְׁרָה יִרְדָּה**. But the clause here is absent in 𐤇 (*B al.*), and is a gloss from Is., with neglect of the necessary fem. subject to the verb. Meinhold continues rewriting on the basis of Is.—11. **מְרַאדָה** : MSS **מְרַאדָה** = Is. The *b* represents actual Bab. variety of pronunciation ; cf. foll. 'Baladan' = 'Apal-iddina,' and the process *m > u* (Delitzsch, *Ass. Gram.*, §49, a) ; see Brock., *GVG* 1, §85, at length for labial dissimilation. Accordingly correction should not be made (as with St., *BH*, but see Haupt's note). The vocalization is abusive, prob. a diminutive form ; see Note on **בָּצַע**, 8²¹.—12. **מַפְרִים** : the inconcinnity of the foll. **עֲלֵיהֶם** induced the addition in 𐤇 of Is., 'and ambassadors' ; deceived by this Duhm, *al.*, would correct to **סַרְסִים** ('eunuchs'), which St. condemns.—**מְנַהֵם** : the Gr. renderings as at 8⁸.—**הוֹקִיחוּ** ; Is., **וַיִּחַוּ** (= 𐤇, 𐤇 combining both rdgs.) ; St. rejoins that the root is never used in the sense required here.—

13. וישמע. a few MSS, Is., וישמח = VSS (𐤔 'received,' 'welcomed'), which is to be accepted. כל-: very many MSS, Ken., deR., 𐤔 𐤀 𐤅, Is. om.—בית [בית]: an Akkadism; see GB.—שמן הטוב: Is., identifying *šib* with Arab. *šayb*, 'aroma,' and so nominal here, as at Jer. 6²⁰, Song 7¹⁰, etc.—14. אמרו: MS 93 + 𐤀 = 𐤔^w 𐤔 𐤀; similarly below many MSS + אלי to באו = VSS, Is.—*N.b.* variation of aspect between אמרו and יבאו, like variation appearing in Ugaritic; see *RSMT* 25.—16. יהוה: Is. + צבאות = 𐤆^L παντοκράτορος, γ Σαβαωθ.—17. הנה ימים באים = Am. 8¹¹, 9¹³, etc.; Grr., exc. B A + 'said the Lord,' with reminiscence of such passages.—18. נמך: in this connexion unique, and St. would correct to כנענייה (*cf.* Gen. 15⁴); but the vocable was ancient enough to induce the foll. gloss, אשר תוליד.—יקח: Grr., 𐤔 as יקח; 𐤀, some MSS, Is., יקחי; St. rightly retains Kt. as יקח.—כריכים: *cf.* Note on Rab-saris, 18¹⁷; the orig. mng. is to be retained here with VSS, exc. 𐤔 = JV.—19. ויאמר הלא אם שלום ואמת יהיה בימי (𐤔^H ✕), A alone tr. literally, *μη ουκ εαν, κ. τ. λ.* (*cf.* 𐤔^H); otherwise the VSS, exc. 𐤔, as precativ, *e.g.*, 𐤅, "sit pax et veritas in diebus meis." Is. simplifies: ויאמר כי יהיה ונ'—21. ויאתו: 𐤆^L + "and was buried with his fathers in David's city"; 𐤆^H "and was buried in D.'s city." Ch. has an original and doubtless true tradition that "they buried him in the ascent of the tombs of David's sons."

ADDITIONAL NOTE ON EXTRACTS FROM CERTAIN ISAIANIC MEMOIRS AND ON THE RELATIONS OF HEZEKIAH AND SENNACHERIB, II. 18¹³-20¹⁹

In addition to the parallels in Ch., which goes its own way in deletion of diverse materials, these cc. appear in duplicate in Is. 37-39, the latter omitting 18¹⁴⁻¹⁶ (as not pertinent to the Isaiah story, and probably as derogatory to the fame of the king and the temple), and adding Hezekiah's prayer upon his illness, 38⁹⁻²⁰. The text of Is. is in briefer form, as against amplifications in Ki.; *cf.* 38⁴⁻⁶ with Ki. 20⁴⁻⁶; 38⁷⁻⁹ with 20⁹⁻¹¹. The curt summary in Is. 38²¹⁻²², has been supplementarily added, and appears now to be universally regarded as secondary, and so, *e.g.*, by Kuenen (*Einl.*, 2, 84 ff., with full review of earlier literature) Stade (*Akad. Reden*, 214 ff.), Driver (*Int.*, 226 f.), Eissfeldt (*Einl.*, 369 ff.). With these duplicate texts, and still more with the complex of historical problems in view of the external history, no section of Ki. has produced more critical debate.¹

¹ Most convenient for study of the parallel texts, Hebrew and Greek is Vanutelli's apparatus; translation of the Hebrew texts is similarly presented by Klost., Kittel, Crockett, Kent. For specific studies of the parallel texts of Ki. and Is. (the MS variations are presented by Bär in his Appendix of 'Diversitates,' pp. 155 ff.) see the fundamental work of Gesenius, *Der Prophet Jesaja* (1820-21); Stade in *SBOT*.

The narrative divides on the surface into five distinct sections. A. 18¹³⁻¹⁶ is an original historical notice of Hezekiah's capitulation to Sennacherib by payment of a heavy indemnity, a very remarkable domestic record of such a humiliation. B. 18¹⁷⁻¹⁹. The demand of the Rab-shakeh, accompanied with a large army, for the surrender of Jerusalem is followed by the prophet Isaiah's comforting prediction upon Hezekiah's appeal to him. C. 19⁸⁻³⁷. Following the Rab-shakeh's return to him, being now engaged at Libnah, Sennacherib, disturbed

Cheyne on Is. in *SBOT*; Kuenen, *Einl.*, §45; Dr., *Int.*, 226 f. (a compact statement); Meinhold, *Die Jesajaerzählungen* (1898—the most extensive monograph on the subject with full text-critical as well as historical discussion); J. Ziegler, *Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta d. Buches Isaias* (1934), also the elaborate corpus in his *Isaias* (1939) in the Göttingen *Septuaginta*; Orlinsky, 'The Kings-Isaiah Recensions of the Hezekiah Story,' Part I, *JQR* 30 (1939), 33 ff., with notable studies of the character and quantum of the Gr. texts and of particular critical questions; for inner textual variations see Sperber's monograph on *Hebrew . . . in Parallel Transmission*. The commentaries on Is., a book far more fully commented upon than Ki., are to be consulted; see Dr., p. 214, and the listing in Eissf., *Einl.*, 341; there is to be noted in this connexion the commentary of O. Procksch, *Jesaja I* (1930). For the historical background see the continuations of the Histories cited in Comm., n. 1, to ch. 17 (p. 464); in particular may be cited Kittel, *GVI* 1, 3, Beilage I, pp. 430-9. The following historical monographs are to be noted: J. V. Prašek, 'Sanheribs Feldzüge gegen Juda,' *MVG* 1903, pt. 4; Olmstead, 'Western Asia in the Reign of Sennacherib,' *Proc. Am. Hist. Assn.*, 1909, 94 ff.; Dhorme, *RB* 7 (1910), 501 ff. (on the Ass. campaigns); Rogers, 'Sennacherib and Judah,' *ZAW*, Beih. 27 (1914), 317 ff. (with extensive discussion of the development of historical criticism, this material summarized in his *CP* 336 ff.); L. L. Honor, *Sennacherib's Invasion of Palestine*, Columbia Univ. thesis, 1926; Wiener, 'Isaiah and the Siege of Jerusalem,' *JSOR* 1927, 195 ff. (with extensive reconstructions); W. Rudolph, 'Sanherib in Palästina,' *Pjb.*, 25 (1929), 59 ff.; C. Boutflower, *The Book of Isaiah I-XXXIX, in the Light of the Ass. Monuments*, 1930. For the illumination of the history from the book of Isaiah see also BDD *s.v.*; W. R. Smith, *The Prophets of Israel* (1882); G. A. Smith, *The Book of Isaiah I* (1927); Robinson, *Decline and Fall*, 73 ff., 138 ff.; James, *Personalities of the O.T.*, ch. 14. In some of the studies of text and history much labour has been lost in attempts at rewriting. *E.g.*, Klost. would read 'Sargon' for 'Sennacherib,' 18¹³, 'Ashdod' for 'Lachish,' v.14, 'Solomon' for 'Hezekiah,' v.16; Cheyne replaces 'Lachish' with 'Eshcol.' Meinh. om. 18²² (as not pertinent to the oration), and following Duhm, 18^{32b-35}, also the phrase 'to reproach the Living God,' 19⁴, and rewrites the 'joint' in 19^{8. 9}. But it is in general impossible to rewrite such historical records, and in particular ancient rhetoric, in *csnh* arbitrary fashion.

by the report of Tirhakah's advance, sends to Hezekiah, demanding complete surrender; the latter presents the letter before YHWH; on divine motion Isaiah recited a defiant ode against Assyria (vv. 20-28), followed with more prosaic oracles (vv. 29-34); there ensues in that night the wholesale destruction of the great Assyrian army, followed by Sennacherib's return home and his murder by his sons. D. 20¹⁻¹¹. Hezekiah's grievous illness is healed by Isaiah with a medical application, the prophet further reassuring him with the miracle of the sun-dial. E. 20¹²⁻¹⁹. Isaiah's word of judgment upon Hezekiah for his courteous reception of the Babylonian embassy, foretelling the doom of his house at Babylon. A more critical division is to be made at the joint between B and C. Here, as Stade has argued, followed, *e.g.*, by Kittel, Skinner, Eissfeldt, and by Meinhold, Marti and Procksch on Isaiah, there is continuance of the theme of the 'rumour' which Sennacherib was to hear, to be followed by his return to his own land, where he is to 'fall by the sword' (v. 7), a rumour that is realized in the news he now 'hears' of Tirhakah's advance against him; the predicted doom appears in vv. 35-37, according to which the king of Assyria broke camp and returned to Nineveh, where he was murdered by his sons. There appears no motivation between Tirhakah's advance (v. 9^a) and the demand for surrender of Jerusalem (v. 9^b). That is, B, as thus extended and so to be understood below, comprises 18¹⁷⁻¹⁹ 9^a, and its sequel is 19³⁶⁻³⁷; and accordingly C, beginning with v. 9^b ("And he sent ambassadors again to Hezekiah," etc.) is duplicate of B.

CC. 18-20 thus present three immediate contacts with the Assyrian empire, and an indirect contact in the reference to the rebel Merodach-baladan's embassy. Of these sections A is uniquely corroborated by an Assyrian inscription, even to the *minutiæ* of figures. B, despite lack of integration with the preceding story of the capitulation, has corroboration of 'the stout force' that accompanied the Rab-shakeh in Sennacherib's record of his blockade of Jerusalem, his statement recording Hezekiah's capitulation and the heavy ransom he paid, but without surrender. The list of Hezekiah's diplomatic commission of three officers of state for treating with the Assyrian includes the names of Hilkiyah, Over-the-House, and Shebna, the Scribe, but in relations not dependent upon the Isaianic oracles referring to them (Is. 22¹⁶), according to which Shebna was to have disappeared in disgrace. The conclusion of B (19³⁷) is a datum of prime historical interest with its specific details of Sennacherib's murder. C duplicates B with the story of a further demand for surrender of Jerusalem, with only the king and the prophet as actors; it concludes (v. 35) with the legend of the miraculous destruction of the Assyrian army in one night, *en masse*, which has its traditional parallel in the Egyptian legend preserved by Herodotus of the plague of mice which upset Sennacherib's army.²

² The figure of '185,000' as smitten has its parallel in the Bab. tradition of Naram-sin's army of '180,000' which he lost (Güterbock, ZA 1938, 55).

D gives a personal story of Hezekiah and Isaiah ; the reference to the king of Assyria (20⁶) is doubtless an addition. E, while again a personal story of king and prophet, is of historical value and interest in presenting the widespread revolt against Assyria engineered by the persistent and crafty Merodach-baladan.

Criticism of these narratives is indeed confused by the interlocking of affairs of now approved accuracy with stories of a prophet, involving two cases of historically absurd statement, the one of the divine slaughter of 185,000 men in one night, the other of the recession of the solar shadow on the dial, as also Isaiah's alleged prediction of the Babylonian exile. Literary criticism is further complicated by the problem of the source of the material, evidently a collection of Memoirs of Isaiah, with oracles attributed to him, of the genuineness of which we may well be sceptical in view of the increasing accretion of attributions to the Prophets, as witnessed in the Prophetic books of the canon. We are here confronted for the first time with such memoirs of a canonical prophet, to be paralleled only by those of Jeremiah a century later. But the *genre* is not new ; it follows the literary tradition that had grown up in full form about the figures of Elijah and Elisha and other Sons of the Prophets ; similarly there had assembled about Isaiah a school of followers whom he specifically calls his ' disciples ' (Is. 8¹⁶). We may well assume that the literary richness which had marked the North wandered South to find a home and there express itself. Chronological order is not to be expected in such a series of stories, any more than in the editing of the Prophets. The humiliation of Hezekiah (A) is naturally made to precede the stories of his deliverance ; Merodach-baladan's mission is narrated at the end, as associated with Hezekiah's sickness unto death and the prophet's evil omen for the future of the dynasty. Similarly we may note that while Ki. records as one of ' acts of Hezekiah ' his water-works at Jerusalem, Ch. (II. 32¹⁻⁸) puts the ' stopping of the fountains ' of the city before the Assyrian approach. Accordingly the order of events is subject to revision. A should follow B, for sake of co-ordination with the Assyrian record. Kittel (*GVI* 2, 435) would preserve the order A B, suggesting that B followed a breach of faith on Sennacherib's part, *cf.* Is. 33¹⁷.³

In particular as to the relation of B and C—whether as parallel or independent stories—critical opinion remains divided. For the latter view there is the argument which would find historical background for the appearance of Tirhakah, who did not succeed to the Egyptian throne until 688-687 B.C., and for the asserted sequel at end of ch. 19 of Sennacherib's end. An explanation was first proposed by G. Rawlinson (according to Rogers), to wit, that Sennacherib campaigned in his latter

³ The co-ordination and historical evaluation of the several narratives still remain an object of dispute. Honor presents (pp. xiii, xiv) six different hypotheses that have been offered by critics ; Stade uses six different colours for his critical presentation of the text.

years against Tirhakah and that the second demand for Jerusalem's surrender was connected with this campaign. This argument is based upon denial of Tirhakah's importance before his accession; yet *cf.* Breasted, Alt, Meyer, as cited in connexion with 19^{9a}. The view under discussion has been accepted by a large number of scholars, *e.g.*, by Dhorme (pp. 516 ff.), Prašek, Jeremias, *ATLAO* 530; Šanda argues for progressive history in B and C, and S. Smith (pp. 13 ff.) and Robinson (*Decline and Fall*, 85 f.) allow or prefer the possibility of two events. On the other hand, Meinhold, Alt, Olmstead, Meyer, deny the historical independence of the two narratives. Stade treats the two narratives with equal scepticism, 'beide sind legendarisch' (*Akad. Reden*, 219). More light may yet be thrown upon the notable original data concerning Sennacherib's departure from Lachish to Libnah and the news of the advance of Tirhakah—a note which may be out of place. As we are dealing with a prophetic story-book based upon traditional acts and words of the prophet, it is far simpler to regard the two stories as variant traditions of Isaiah's part in the historical drama. Of the oracles only the ode, 19²¹⁻²⁸, can claim literary affinity to Isaiah, and so, *e.g.*, Eissfeldt adjudges it as 'probably genuine' (*Einkl.*, 371), and Šanda claims it as genuine. Whether the two following oracles, vv.²⁹⁻³¹, ³²⁻³⁴, rather prosaic pieces, have such affinity is dubious, although Isaianic origin is accepted, *e.g.*, by Kittel (Comm.), Šanda, Procksch, Eissfeldt; the notion of a future 'sign' (v.²⁹) has its parallel in Is. 7¹⁴.⁴ *Cf.* also the discussion between Burkitt (*JTS* 1933, 396 ff.) and Budde (*ib.*, 1934, 307 ff.). Of the two prophetic stories B doubtless deserves precedence with its content of exact historical detail; the historically colourless C is to be characterized in the words of the conservative Kittel as 'eine stark sagenhaft geartete Parallele zu der vorigen.'

⁴ The problem of Isaiah's political position has been much discussed. K. Fullerton has at length denied Isaiah's part in the nationalistic politics of the day in the foll. articles: 'The Book of Isaiah: Critical Problems,' *HTR* 1913, 478 ff.; 'Viewpoints in the Discussion of Isaiah,' *JBL* 41 (1922), 1 ff.; 'Isaiah's Attitude in the Sennacherib Campaign,' *AJSL* 42 (1925), 1 ff. Subsequent literature is given by Kittel (*GVI* 2, 384, n. 3), he himself being in opposition to Fullerton, and by W. A. Irwin, with criticism of the preceding studies, who comes to the support of Fullerton, in 'Isaiah in the Crisis of 701,' *JR* 1936, 406 ff. The present writer finds himself cautious before doctrines based upon too idealistic conceptions of the prophets. Amos and Hosea were prophets of doom, and they predicted without restraint. Isaiah was in a different political and religious situation, and was doubtless a man of unique type. His partnership with Hezekiah, an able and ambitious king, by which he encouraged the monarch's faith in the God of Israel, is no stranger than that of Luther with Landgraf Philip of Hesse or of the English Reformers with Henry VIII, neither of which monarchs was a saint or even religious.

Finally, it is to be observed that these stories have full contemporary flavour, not only in the several historical details which they include, but also in their reflection of the times. We may compare the Elijah and Elisha cycles. The Assyrian Rab-shakeh might well have argued in such a blustering oration as is presented in 18^{19a}, even as a contemporary odist might have celebrated the fall of the tyrant as in 19^{29a}. The stories, if such they be rather than histories, were of early composition and within the Assyrian age—this judgment *vs.* Marti, who would assign the Rab-shakeh narrative to *ca.* 500 B.C., and its parallel to a still later date. Procksch pertinently remarks on the orations (p. 446): “Die Rede des *Rabšaqe* in beiden Teilen ist geschickt angelegt, auch die Apostrophe von den Gesandten an das Volk sehr wirksam. Wenn sie auch wie die Reden bei Thukydides und Cäsar auf Rechnung des Schriftstellers kommt, so hält sie sich doch in den historischen Grenzen und verdient als rhetorische Leistung Anerkennung.”

Ch. 21. The reigns of Manasseh and Amon. || 2 Ch. 33 ; *cf. Ant.*, x, 3-4, 1. Apart from the usual dynastic items the ch., covering over half a century, is devoted to the history of those kings' outrageous abandonment of the True Religion. But there was little else of national history to record in the two generations, when Judah was a pawn of Assyria under its conquering monarchs, Esarhaddon (681-669) and Ashurbanipal (669-626), who brought their empire to the pitch of its extent in enveloping Elam, Anatolia, Syria, Arabia, Egypt ; see the pertinent chapters in the Histories. 'Manasseh king of Judah' (*Menāše šar Iaudi*) appears in a list of twenty-two named kings and their kingdoms in an inscription of Esarhaddon's (Prism B, col. 5, *KB* 2, 149, *ATB* 1, 357, *ARA* 2, §610, *AB* 476 f.). Ashurbanipal reports as among his vassals in his first campaign against Tirhakah, 'king of Egypt and Cush,' twenty-two kings, including Manasseh, *Minše ša Iaudi* (Prism C : *KB* 2, 238 f., *ARA* 2, §876). There are two late Biblical references to Assyrian deportations into Palestine, by Esarhaddon and by 'the noble Asenappar,' *i.e.*, Ashurbanipal (Ezra, 4². 9^a). There is also the doubtless true tradition (*cf.* Eissfeldt, *Einl.*, 612), preserved in Ch. (vv.¹¹⁻¹³. 18. 19) of Manasseh's captivity in Babylon (taken thither 'with hooks,' *cf.* 19²⁸), in celebration of which and of the king's repentance the apocryphon of the Prayer of Manasseh was composed. Among such royal captives at his court Ashurbanipal lists kings of Egypt, among them Necho, whom he later restored,

and large groups of royal hostages (*KB* 2, 167 ff., *ARA* 2, §§774, 779 ff.). For the religious retrogression of this period in face of the Assyrian terror and fascination, on which the prophet Zephaniah is the commentator, see Kittel, *GVI* 2, §48; Robinson, *HI* 401 ff.

VV.¹⁻¹⁸. The reign of Manasseh. After the preliminary data, stating the longest regnal term in the history of the dynasty, 55 years, the history is devoted to the king's apostasy. It is a homily of Deuteronomistic character (*cf.* Burney, Stade, *Akad. Reden*, 224 ff.), with a few original data, contained in vv.³⁻⁷, and v.¹⁸, a specific item as to his burial; v.¹⁶ may contain a true tradition of his bloody reign. The listing of abominations in vv.^{3ff.} is largely independent of that in ch. 23, and has archival characteristics (see Notes).

3. *He built again the high-places that his father Hezekiah had destroyed, and he erected an altar [the altars] to the Baal, and made an Asherah, just as Ahab king of Israel had made, and he worshipped all the host of heaven, and served them.*

4. *And he built altars in the house of YHWH, as to which will I set my Name.* **5.** *And he built altars for all the host of heaven in the two courts of the house of YHWH.*

6. *And he made his son to pass through the fire, and he practised augury and divination, and he made 'ôb and wizards—he increased in doing the evil in YHWH's eyes to provocation.* **7.** *And he set the image of the Asherah that he made in the house of which YHWH said to David and to his son Solomon: In this house and in Jerusalem, which I have chosen out of all the tribes of Israel, will I put my Name for ever.* VV.⁸⁻⁹ continue the homily on the tragedy.

V.³. For the sing. 'altar' of Baal see Note. The reference to 'an Asherah' depends upon the more explicit statement in v.⁷, where the Asherah is definitely an image. Of vv.⁴⁻⁵ the latter is generally assumed (*e.g.*, by Kittel, Stade) to be the secondary one, dependent on 23¹²; but the objective of the worship of the altars is required. Rather v.⁴ with its homiletic observation is secondary, and indeed a duplicate of v.⁷. For the problem of 'the two courts' (=23¹², *cf.* 'the middle court,' 20⁴) see Smith, *Jerusalem*, 2, 64, 256 ff., etc. This

developed astral worship (see further Comm. on 23^{4ff.}), popularized as Zephaniah records (1⁵), and referred to in Jeremiah's note of the popular worship of 'the queen of heaven' (7¹⁸), came in with the Assyrian domination as part of the obligation of subject states to the empire; e.g., there were the ritual dues for 'Ashur and Bêlit, and the gods of Assyria,' required by Ashurbanipal; so Luckenbill, *ARA* 2, §798, Schrader translating differently, *KB* 2, 195, as of imposition of their 'cults.'

6. The v. lists autochthonous rites, paralleled in the condemnation of 17¹⁷. *He made his son to pass through the fire*, even as did Ahaz (16³), and a practice presented as usual in 23¹⁰. *And he practised augury and divination.* For the second term (root *nhš*) cf. 17¹⁷, I. 20³³; the first term (root 'nn) is explained by Dhorme as from 'ānān, 'cloud,' i.e., 'cloud-observer' (*L'Évolution religieuse d'Israël*, 229 ff.). According to Is. 2⁶ this practice was introduced from Philistia. *And he made 'ôb and wizards*; the double term occurs below, 23²⁴, in Is. 8¹⁹ (29⁴ 'ôb alone), and in the anecdote, 1 Sam. 28^{3ff.}, how Saul "removed the 'ôbôt (fem. pl.) and wizards from the land." There Moffatt and Waterman translate the obscure word with 'medium,' evidently on basis of the feminine gender; however the witch of Endor was specifically *ba'alat 'ôb*, 'possessed with an 'ôb.' The word may have been transferred to the person possessed, just as possibly the word 'wizard' may first have meant the 'knowing' spirit; see Burney. The double phrase here appears to be technical: *he practised the art of familiar spirit and wizard(s).* Cf. the variations of translation in the VSS (with the notion of ventriloquism, will-control, etc.) and in modern trr. See Note, and at large Dhorme, pp. 234 ff., and T. W. Rosmarin's extensive Note in *REJ* 98 (1934), 95-9, with history of interpretation and essays at etymology. These superstitious rites were germane enough to Palestinian soil, but the fashion was re-introduced by the spell of the Babylonian religion.

VV.¹⁰⁻¹⁵. The doom of Jerusalem and Judah, put anonymously in the mouth of YHWH's *servants the prophets*; cf. Dt. 28^{15ff.} **12.** *Whosoever hears of it, both his ears shall tingle*: the same phrase 1 Sam. 3¹¹, Jer. 19³. **13.** *I will stretch over Jerusalem the line of Samaria and the plummet of Ahab's house*: a rendering into historical terms of the ominous phrase, 'the

line of confusion and the plummet of emptiness' (Is. 34¹¹). The figurative declaration, *I will wipe Jerusalem, as a man wipes a bowl, wiping it and turning it upside down*, is unique. **14.** *I will cast off the remnant of mine inheritance*, etc.: cf. Jer. 12⁷. **16.** *Moreover innocent blood did Manasseh spill, vry much*, etc.: there may well be true tradition here of the martyrdom of the faithful. There exist various forms of the apocryphal 'Martyrdom' or 'Ascension of Isaiah,' according to which Isaiah was sawn asunder in this reign, reminiscence of which appears in Heb. 11³⁷; see R. H. Charles, *The Ascension of Isaiah* (1900), and Schürer, *GJV* 3, 386 ff. For these two generations prophecy appears to have been silenced. **17.** Among the acts of Manasseh recorded in the chronicles, was the sin that he sinned, i.e., an official record of his religious innovations. **18.** Of Uzzah's garden, which the king had acquired for his tomb, nothing further is known except for his son Amon's interment there (v.²⁶).

For the extensive influence of this ch. on Ezekiel see Torrey, *Pseudo-Ezekiel* (1930), 64 ff.

VV.¹⁹⁻²⁶. The reign of Amon. **19.** For his age at accession see Comm. on 22¹. His mother's father's name, Harus, is probably Arabic (see Note), and the place of his origin, Yotebah, is to be identified with the place two stations from Esyon-geber noted in Num. 33³³, Dt. 10⁷. Jerome's *Onomasticon* places it in Judah, but it appears, listed next to Aila-Elath in the fifth and sixth centuries as seat of a bishopric (Abel, *GP* 2, 201). **23.** *And Amon's courtiers conspired against him and killed the king in his house.* **24.** *And the people of the land slew all the conspirators against king Amon. And the people of the land made Josiah his son king in his stead.* It is pure assumption to explain the assassination from popular political grounds, as do Galling, *Die israelitische Staatsverfassung*, 33 f., Causse, *Du groupe ethnique*, 118 ff., for it was the demos that at once took revenge upon the murderers. This interference in the court by 'the people of the land' is the most democratic action recorded in the history; cf. 11^{13ff.}, 23³⁰.

1. מְנַשֶּׁה: to list of extra-Israelite occurrences of the name in GB is to be added Rhodian *Μνασῶς* (Harris, *Gram.*, 126); it means 'causing to forget,' i.e., an earlier loss in the family; similar affectional names are Menahem, 'consoler,' Tanhumath,

'consolation'; cf. Noth, *IP* 222.—**3.** מִזְבְּחֹתָי: Grr., 𐤌𐤇=מִזְבְּחֹתָי, as at I. 16³², the pl. being induced by Ch., 'altars for the Baals.'—**4.** וּבִנְיָה: cf. the four pfs. in similar usage in v.⁶; for the archival usage see on 14⁷.—מִזְבְּחֹתָי: Grr. as sing.—יְהוָה 2⁰: B A 𐤇𐤍 om., as redundant.—**5.** מִזְבְּחֹתָי: Grr. (exc. 𐤇𐤍), 𐤌𐤇 as sing.—בְּשֵׁנָי: Hex., 𐤁 'in all'.—**6.** בְּנֹו: Ch., בְּנֹו=Grr., 𐤌𐤇; but the use of the sing. is technical.—אֹנִי: B† ελλην, early error (so an 𐤍 text, 𐤇) for θελητην=A N and most MSS, even as Grr. at 23²⁴, θελητας; cf. Aquila at Lev. 20⁶. This interpretation may have come by reference to root אנה (so Liddell and Scott) with association of the idea of 'will-control' over nature, spirits, even as θέλειν is used in *Corpus Hermeticum*, xiii, 7, θέλησον καὶ γίγεται, also the nouns θέλησις, θέλημα (C. Wesseley, *Griechische Zauberpapyrus*, in *Denkschriften* of the Vienna Academy, vol. 36, p. 151, and *Neue griech. Zauberpapyri*, *ib.*, vol. 42, p. 86); for these reff. the writer is indebted to Prof. A. D. Nock. Lucian has εγγαστριμυθους, 'ventriloquists,' as at 23²⁴; 𐤌𐤇 zakkōrē=𐤌, 'remembrancers,' i.e., control by use of names or charm-words (?) 'pithones' of 𐤃 is the basis of EVV, 'familiar spirits.'—יִרְעִיבֹו: 12 MSS as sing.=Ch., as though in the sequence the sing. were required; cf. the rdgs. of the whole phrase at 23²⁴ and I Sam. 28³⁻⁹ with variations of the numbers. 'Wizards' of EVV (exc. JV, which paraphrases here) is an excellent etymological rendering.—לֹהֲבַעֲיָם: many MSS, Ch., לֹהֲבַעֲיָם=VSS; but the absolute use appears also at 23¹⁹ (where VSS+'the Lord'), and the phrase should be kept.—**7.** שְׂטִי: Grr. (exc. B=𐤇) as +שְׂטִי.—**8.** יִשְׁתְּרוּ: 𐤇𐤍 𐤇 Lucif. as though יִשְׁתְּרוּ.—לַעֲשׂוֹת כָּל־: OGr. om. לַע; Hex., 'to do all'=Heb. MS 23.—וּלְבַל־: MS 70, Ch., לְבַל=Grr. (𐤌𐤇 'like all'), to be preferred, the prep. continuing the acc. construction as at I. 1⁹ (cf. Haupt).—**9.** הָרַע: 𐤇+'in the Lord's eyes'; 𐤇+'before the Lord'.—**11.** לִפְנֵי . . . הָרַע: 𐤇 om. הָרַע; St. regards the asyndetic passage as duplication of v.⁹, cf. *BH*.—**12.** וְיִהְיֶה: St. elides for lack of repeated prep.; but 3 MSS have וְיִהְיֶה=Grr., and so to be emended.—שְׁטַעֲיוּ: read with 𐤍, MSS שְׁטַעֲיוּ=Grr.—**13.** קָו: so *BH* (MSS L C *al.*); but read קָו, as construct, with Mich., Bär, Ginsb.—צְלוֹת־: cf. צְלוֹת־, 2²⁰.—קָוָה וְקָוָה: read as abs. infinitives, קָוָה וְקָוָה.—For v.¹⁰ 𐤃 has an original interpretation: "et delebo Hierusalem, sicut deleri solent tabulæ; delens vertam, et ducam crebrius stilum super faciem eius"; this is defended by Joüon (*Méi.*, 5, 483) with suggestion of לוֹחֵת for צְלוֹת.—**16.** פָּה לַצֶּה: 'level to the brim'; cf. 10²¹.—הַטְּאֵנוּ: VSS here and at v.¹⁷ wrongly as pl.—**18.** 𐤇 om., prob. by parablepsis; similar abbreviation in Heb. MSS.—**19.** אֲמוֹן: the name at I. 22²⁶; 𐤇 Αμωσ.—טַשְׁלֵט־: the name in the Elephantine papp.; cf. טַשְׁלֵט, 22³, טַשְׁלֵט, 22¹⁴; for such names see Noth, *IP* 174.—הַרְוִין־: a Phœn. name (Harris, *Gram.*, 104); but in this connexion it is to be identified with Arab. names, Sinaitic הַרְוִין (Lidzb., *HNE* 280), Lihyanian הַרְוִין (*NPS* 1, 99).—יָקָדָה: the closest Gr. traditior

is Yetaba = 𐤉 'Iethba'; the form has come by procession of the stem-vowel from yaṭūb, root טוּב; cf. 𐤏𐤍𐤁, 14⁷.—22. 1 יהוה : 2 MSS om. = 𐤇^L.—23. עברי אמן : Ch., עברי = Gr. MSS, 𐤉. — ויטתו את המלך : Ch., ויטתו = 𐤇^L 𐤍. —24. ויך : Ch., ויכו = 𐤇^L, ignoring the collective use of הארץ ; עם הארץ ; withal the pl. follows. —25. אשר עשה : 18 MSS pref. וכל = 𐤇^L 𐤕 𐤍 𐤁. —26. ויקבר : 22 MSS Ken., deR., ויקברו ; of the VSS 𐤕^w alone has the sing. ; Haupt defends the sing. as impersonal, cf. 18⁴. VSS necessarily followed with their own idiom, and so EVV with the passive.— בקברתו : 𐤇^L 'in his father's grave,' recalling v. 18.

Ch. 22-23³⁰. The reign of Josiah. || 2 Ch. 34-5 ; cf. *Ant.*, x, 4-5, 1.

22¹⁻². Introduction. **1.** *Eight years old was Josiah when he began to reign.* Suspicion is cast upon the figure by the Hebrew grammar, which normally requires a numeral higher than ten with the sg. noun *šānāh* ; but see Note. Josiah's sons Jehoiakim and Jehoahaz were respectively 25 and 23 years old at the end of his life (*ca.* 38 years), and his father died in his 23d year, the present item making him a father in his 14th year—all cases of early paternity indeed, but not sufficient ground for correcting the father's given age (*vs.* Klostermann, Šanda). The reign may be dated *ca.* 639-608 B.C. With the death of Ashurbanipal in 626, and pending the doom of his empire, the subject provinces scented a fresh breath of liberty, and it was in these circumstances that in Josiah's 18th year (621 B.C.) a reform was effected based upon the nationalistic tradition and religion. There is no hint of international relations until the end of the reign with Josiah's tragic death in battle against the invader Pharaoh-Necho (23²⁹).

V.³⁻²³²⁷. The great reformation. For criticism of this detailed history see Additional Note after 23³⁰. It opens with the account of an accidental discovery.

VV.³⁻⁷. Repairs ordered for the temple. **3.** *In the eighteenth year of king Josiah:* Ch. records that "in the eighth year of his reign, while he was yet young, he began to seek after the God of his father David ; and in the twelfth year he began to purge Judah and Jerusalem," etc., picking up our passage subsequently with "in the eighteenth year of his reign," etc.—altogether an attempt to display Josiah's early piety. He followed the precedent of his pious ancestor Jehoash

(12^{5ff.}) in requiring careful handling of the temple receipts of loose silver, but his orders were more promptly carried out. He commissions for the purpose a high officer, *Shaphan ben Azaliah ben Meshullam, the secretary*. The name of Shaphan occurs in subsequent ancestries (25²², Jer. 36^{11f.}), but the relationships cannot be determined. Ch. 34⁸ associates with Shaphan two others, 'Maaseiah, the governor of the city, and Joah ben Joahaz, the recorder.' 4. Shaphan's commission is thus recorded: *Go up to Hilkiyah the high priest, and have him smelt [𐤀=EVV sum up] the silver brought into the house of YHWH, which the keepers of the threshold have collected from the people, 5. and let them (collective) give it into the hand of those who do the work (namely), those in charge in the house of YHWH, and let them give it to those who do the work in the house of YHWH, to repair the dilapidation of the house.* VV.^{4b-7} have close verbal parallelism with 12¹²⁻¹⁶, and Stade properly eliminates the whole passage as secondary, clumsy as it is in its arrangement; it would expand in detail what is briefly reported to the king in v.⁹. Hilkiyah is called *high priest*, also at v.⁸ and 23⁴, otherwise *inf.* simply *priest*; for the secondary character of the adj. see Comm., 12¹¹. Hilkiyah was grandfather of Seraiah (25¹⁸), father of Jehosadak, who went into captivity (1 Ch. 5^{40f.}). Ancient tradition identified him with Jeremiah's father (Jer. 1¹), but the name was common (also Jer. 29³), and the prophet, 'of the priests in Anathoth,' belonged to the line of Abiathar, not of Sadok (see Graf, *Jeremia*, 1862, 12 f.; Šanda). For the verb 'to smelt,' by slight correction of 𐤀, and so also in v.⁹, see Note, and cf. similar terminology, also with correction of 𐤀, in 12¹¹.

VV.⁸⁻¹³. The discovery of the book of the Law, and the effect upon the king. 8. *And Hilkiyah the high priest said to Shaphan the secretary: I have found the book of the Law in the house of YHWH. And Hilkiyah delivered the book to Shaphan, and he read it.* 9. *And Shaphan the secretary came to the king, and he reported to the king and said: Thy servants have smelted the silver that was found in the house, and have given it into the hands of the workers in charge of the house of YHWH.* 10. *And Shaphan the secretary told the king, as follows: Hilkiyah the priest has given me a book. And Shaphan read it before the king.* According to the dramatic story the scribe leaves it to

the king to recognize the character of the book. **11.** *And it was, when the king heard the words of the book of the Law, that he rent his clothes.* **12.** *And the king gave orders to Hilkiyah the priest, and Ahikam ben Shaphan, and Achbor ben Micaiah, and Shaphan the secretary, and Asaiah the king's minister, to wit: —.* For the commission, properly headed by the priest, *cf.* 19². Ahikam was father of the notable Gedaliah, 25^{22f.}. For listing of the many contemporary seals of officials with the title 'minister' (Heb. 'slave'—*cf.* I. 1²) of the 'king' see Albright, *JBL* 51 (1932), 79 f.; A. Bergman, *ib.*, 55 (1936), 221 ff. **13.** *Go, inquire of YHWH on my behalf and on behalf of the people 'and on behalf of all Judah' (secondary, see Note) concerning the words of this book that has been found; for great is YHWH's wrath that is kindled against us, because our fathers have not listened to the words of this book, to do according to all that is written in it [It] against us; see Note].* The reader would recall the curses of Dt. 28^{15ff.}, 29^{21ff.}; *cf.* the report of Jeremiah's preaching of 'this covenant,' Jer. 11. C to Eze. 1¹ knows the exact place and date of the discovery of the book.

VV.¹⁴⁻²⁰. The application of the commission to a prophetess and her direful response. **14.** The commission, headed by the priest, and of its own volition, *went to the prophetess Huldah, wife of Shallum ben Tikvah ben Harhas, keeper of the wardrobe [Heb. garments]; now she dwelt in Jerusalem, in the second quarter. And they told her.* Why did a chief priest inquire of a woman? And who was she? The question has been asked since at least Kimchi's day, and his explanations have been pursued by the comm. in Poole, that Jeremiah was not in the city, he had gone to warn the ten tribes, etc. Jeremiah was already a commissioned prophet since the 13th year of the reign, and Zephaniah must have preceded the Reformation (*cf.* Horst, Comm. in *HAT*, 1938). We have to remind ourselves that judgments upon personalities and their part in history vary between that of contemporaries and that of posterity. Indeed Jeremiah felt himself to be a forgotten man in his day. Huldah left no book. As prophetess she had predecessors in Miriam and Deborah; later there appear in the rôle of prophetess one Noadiah, whom Nehemiah denounced (Neh. 6¹⁴), Anna, the pious aged saint of the temple (Luke 2³⁶), and that 'Jezebel of a prophetess' (Rev. 2²⁰).

Two gates named after Huldah were at the south end of the temple, according to *Middoth* i, 2 (cf. Smith, *Jerusalem*, 2, 517). And why did not Josiah himself, as did Hezekiah (19^{14ff.}), go direct to the temple to receive comfort? Her husband's duty as *keeper of the wardrobe* is not specific for us, whether as officer of the king or of the temple (for the latter cf. 10²²). The *second quarter* (Heb. *mišnèh*) is generally taken as the expansion of Jerusalem towards the north; see Smith, *ib.*, 2, 202. According to Neh. 3⁹.¹³ there were two 'half-districts' of Jerusalem; for discussion of possible identification of the word with the corrupted (?) *yěšānāh*, translated 'the old city,' of Neh. 3⁶, 12³⁹, see M. Burrows, *JBL* 54 (1935), 37.

15. *And she said to them: Thus has spoken YHWH the God of Israel: Say to the man who sent you to me (before God, the king is but a man):* **16.** *Thus has YHWH spoken: Behold, I am bringing evil upon this place and upon its citizens, all the words of the book which the king of Judah has read.* **17.** *Because they have deserted me, and burnt incense to other gods, so as to provoke me with all the work of their hands, my wrath is kindled against this place and shall not be quenched.* **18.** There follows a personal oracle of indulgence to the king of Judah, who sent you to inquire of YHWH: Thus shall you say to him: Thus has spoken YHWH the God of Israel: as for the words that thou hast heard: **19.** *Because thy heart is tender, and thou hast humbled thyself before YHWH upon hearing what I have said against this place and its inhabitants, that it should become an [object of] astonishment and curse (the phrase at Jer. 44²²), and thou hast rent thy clothes, and wept before me, I also have heard thee—oracle of YHWH.* **20a.** *Therefore, behold, I will gather thee to thy fathers, and thou shalt be gathered to thy grave in peace, neither shall thy eyes see all the evil that I am bringing upon this place.* Cf. 23^{29f.}, whence the otiose *be gathered to thy grave* has been interpolated here. The prediction that he should *not see all the evil* was fulfilled, but not that he should die *in peace*. In this respect the prophecy was not *post eventum*. **20b.** *And they brought back word to the king.*

1. שְׁמֵנָה שָׁנָה : MS 30 ש' עִשְׂרֵה ש' = Gr. MSS 44, 71; see Note to 8¹⁷, suggesting that in such cases the expected pl., שְׁנֵיִם was written in abbreviated form.—יִאֲשִׁירוּ: the verbal root as in יְהוֹאֲשָׁוּ, 16¹ (see Notes there and on 12¹), with the element in the jussive;

this overcomes the objection of Noth, *IP* 212.—עריה: for other *nn. pr.* with this verb see Noth, *ib.*, 182; עריה occurs on a Palestinian seal (*JPOS* 1938, 114), is also S. Arab. (*NPS* 2, 104).—בצקת: listed by Josh. 15³⁹ between Lachish and Eglon.—2. ולא: 3 MSS ולא = Gr. B i, original, as at I. 22⁴².—3. יאשיהו: OGr. + 'in the 8th month,' 𐤄𐤍 'in the seventh month' (with attempt at dating at the New Year?).—עין: the name has been read erroneously in a seal-stamping, pl. VI to lecture by J. L. Starkey, *PEQ* 1936 178 ff.—אציליהו: Noth (*ib.*, 193) connects with אצילי, Ex. 24¹¹, and Arab. root, 'ašula, 'to be distinguished.'—4. הלקיהו: see Note, 1818.—4. ויהם: generally assumed as of 'summing up' the account (so GV EVV); but 𐤄𐤍 χλωευσσατε; 𐤄𐤍 'conflatur' = 𐤍𐤅, the verb as at v.⁹, the error through easy confusion of archaic כ and ט. For other suggested emendations see Burn., St.—5. ויהנה: a short spelling (but cf. MSS) for 𐤍𐤅. 𐤍𐤅, which is supported by 𐤄𐤍, Hex.; 𐤄𐤍 𐤄𐤍 tr. with the passive, which is interpretation.—על יד ע': cf. Gen. 42²⁷.—המפקרים: so at v.⁹ = המפקרים, 12¹².—בבית: 𐤍𐤅. 𐤍𐤅, as at v.⁹ and 12¹², the Kt. a prepositional phrase developed from the locative.—ויהנו: Grr., κ. εδωκαε (B -κεε); 𐤄𐤍 with plus, 'according to the king's command.'—6. גורים: see Note, 12¹³.—הבית: 12 MSS pref. בורק = Grr., 𐤄𐤍 𐤄𐤍.—8. [שפן]: read with many MSS, Ch., אל.—'Shaphan the secretary'; Grr. (exc. 𐤄𐤍), 𐤄𐤍 om.; the repetition was otiose to translators; similar avoidance of 'to the king' *inf.* by 𐤄𐤍 with 'to him.'—12. ענבור on a seal, *IAE* 185.—מיכיה: also MSS מיכיהו; see Note, I. 22⁸.—עשיה: the name on seals, עשיהו, *ib.*, 187, 197, 218.—13. ובעד כל יהודה: some MSS have introduced various forms of plus from Ch. (which includes N. Israel); the phrase is redundant (St.); 'king and people' is the sufficient constitutional term.—על [שפן א']: the prep. is careless, is so used in Jer. 26⁶.—ההפזר הזה: B i v om., 𐤄𐤍 *; the Law was *the Book!*—עליו: 3 MSS עליו = Grr., exc. 𐤄𐤍; cf. Ch. על הכפר הזה, and *inf.*, 23³; the emendation is to be accepted.—14. הלרה: also name of the wife of Nabataean Aretas IV, *CIS* II, no. 158. For its mng., 'snail,' cf. Shaphan, 'badger,' Achbor, 'field-mouse,' above; such animal names (cf. Noth, *ib.*, 230) appear to have been fashionable at this time.—אשת: B h i 𐤄𐤍, 'mother of.'—שלם: primary name of Josiah's successor (Comm., 23³¹), also appearing in Lachish tablet iv: see Note, 21¹⁹.—תקוה: Ch. Kt., as from the common S. Arab. root *whāh*, the form properly preferred here by Noth (*ib.*, 260).—חרום: Ch., הכרה; VSS support the form here; some MSS חרום, with which cf. S. Arab. *Ḥrḥ* (*NPS* 2, 266).—15. אליהם: B† om.—16. [המקום]: אל: read with Ch.—17. במעשה: 2 MSS, Ch., במעשה = Grr., exc. 𐤄𐤍.—ווצתה: for the irregular consecution cf. 23⁵.—18. הרברים אשר שמעת: of the Grr. 𐤄𐤍, also the other VSS, exc. 𐤄𐤍, paraphrase; Klost., *SBOT*, *al.* offer revisions; Gressmann (*ZAW* 1924, 319) proposes elision of something objectionable. But for such a break in construction cf. a case in 23¹⁷.—19. לפני: 𐤄𐤍 'before me,' correcting

the careless 3d pers.—ולקללה : G^L om. as blasphemy against the Holy City.—20. [אֲבֹתֵיךָ] על : MSS, Ch., א, as also read *inf.*—קָרָתָהּ : read קָרָתָהּ ; cf. 23³⁰.—עַל הַמְּקוֹם הַזֶּה : Grr. (exc. B A), Ch. plus 'and upon its inhabitants.'

Ch. 23¹⁻³. The solemn covenant of king and people with YHWH. **1.** *And the king sent orders, and there were gathered to him all the elders of Judah and Jerusalem.* For the *elders*, a political term, see Comm. on 10¹, I. 8¹. **2.** *And the king went up to the house of YHWH, and all the men of Judah and all the citizens of Jerusalem with him, and the priests and the prophets, and all the people both small and great.* The extent of the congregation seems overdrawn in terms; hence Stade, Eissfeldt would mark as secondary the final phrases, *and the priests*, etc., stylistically indeed a halting addition; but the v. is a vivid statement of an enthusiastic occasion; cf. I. 8^{1ff.}, Dt. 29^{9f.}. The naming of *the prophets* has a contemporary ring, and their part as a guild in the reformation may not be ignored; cf. Jer. 2⁸, where they and the priests are denounced, and for their perversion cf. Jer. 29. Ch. 34³⁰ replaces the item with 'the Levites' (so 2 MSS here), C with 'the scribes,' obvious corrections, like many by modern critics. *And he read in their ears all the words of the book of the covenant that was found in the house of YHWH.* The 'reading by the king' is a formalism; a scribe would have been the actual lector (cf. 22¹⁰). *The book of the covenant* is the most germane of the various titles that have come to be given to that book; see Add. Note, II. **3.** *And the king stood by the pillar [JV on the platform—see on 11¹⁴], and he executed the covenant before YHWH, to go after YHWH, and to keep his commandments and his decrees [EVV testimonies] and his statutes (cf. I. 2³, Dt. 4⁴⁴, etc.) with whole heart and whole soul (cf. Dt. 6⁵, etc.), for ratification of the words of this covenant (cf. Dt. 28⁶⁹), as written in this book. And all the people took stand in [EVV stood to] the covenant.* The last expression, = "entered into the covenant," is a legal term; cf. Dt. 29^{9ff.}. For an earlier covenant of king and people with the Deity see 11¹⁷.

VV. 4-14. The reformation in Jerusalem. **4a.** *And the king commanded Hilkiah the high priest and the priests (25¹⁸ priest) of second rank and the guards of the threshold (cf. 12¹⁰, 22⁴) to bring out from the hall of YHWH all the vessels made for (the)*

Baal and for (the) Asherah and for all the host of heaven; and he burned them outside of Jerusalem in the pyres [EVV fields—see Note] *of Kidron*. The early hierarchy of three orders is presented here, as at 25¹⁸; for the official titles see Note. For the looting of such sacred vessels and the like in a temple cf. a record of Ashurbanipal's (*ARA* 2, §810). The pagan trinity of Baal, Asherah and the Heavenly Host is presented in due form; cf. 17¹⁶, 21³. Gressmann ('Josia u. das Deut.,' *ZAW* 1924, 324 f.) insists properly on Assyrianizing influences, and compares Ashurbanipal's requirement of 'revenues, dues, etc., for Assur and Bêlit, and the gods of Assyria' (cf. Luckenbill, *ARA* 2, 798). But the terminology here is Syro-Palestinian. Baal and Asherah are coupled in the Ugaritic texts (exx. given by H. Bauer, *ZAW* 1933, 89, and in *RSMT* 92); in one Ugaritic text there is the pairing of 'El and Athirat' (Dhorme, *Syria*, 1933, 39); for that field of mythology see the volumes of Nielsen and Schaeffer (the Schweich Lectures, ch. 4) cited in the Bibliography, and at large Dhorme, *L'Évolution religieuse d'Israël*, ch. 19. For the survival of these native Palestinian cults among the Israelite émigrés in Egypt see the discussions on the Elephantine papyri, and especially A. Vincent, *La religion des judéo-araméens d'Éléphantine*. The stellar deities are named more exactly in v.⁵. **4b.** *And he carried their ashes unto Bethel*: this is an absurd addition, suggested by the story in vv.^{15ff.} **5.** *And he estopped the priestlings whom the kings of Judah had appointed 'to burn incense'* [with correction of **¶**—all EVV *sotto voce* so correcting] *at the high-places in the cities of Judah and the suburbs of Jerusalem, and (or even) those who burned incense to (the) Baal, to the sun and the moon and the zodiacal-signs and all the host of heaven*. The v. is an intrusion with its reference to the provincial heathenish rites, interrupting the story of reform in Jerusalem. For *priestlings* (EVV *idolatrous priests*) see Note. The offering of incense, as distinct from sacrifice, to others than YHWH had been condoned by royal authority; cf. the distinction in the Church between the *latreia* of Deity and the *douleia* of the saints. The subordinate aspect of these provincial priests appears in vv.⁸⁻⁹. For such celestial worship cf. Am. 5²⁶, presenting the names of two adopted astral deities, Sakkut (Heb. *sikkût*) and Kewan (Heb. *kîyûn*);

cf. Dt. 4¹⁹, 17³, Jer. 8², etc. The listing of Baal, sun and moon is typically Syrian. The Zakar inscription concludes with ascription to 'Baal of Heaven . . . and Sun and Moon and gods of heaven and gods of earth . . .'; the Aramaic inscription at Tarsus has ascription to 'the Great Baal, Moon and Sun' (Montgomery, *JAOS* 28 [1907], 104 ff.; Lidzbarski, *Eph.*, 3, 1 ff.). For Baal of Heaven see Add. Note to I. 18. Under the Assyrian domination there arose a novel and extensive development of these cults; *cf.* *KAT* 614 ff., Jastrow, *Religious Belief in Bab. and Ass.* (1911), ch. 4. Great as were the scientific results of Babylonian astronomy, the vulgar astrology that followed in its wake broke down the ethos of the simple folk-religions. As Jastrow remarks (p. 230): "The more complicated the system, the greater its hold upon the masses." The Akk. term for the *zodiacal signs* (EVV variously, *planets, constellations, twelve signs*) is unique in the O.T., but is frequent in the later Jewish literature; see Note. 6. *And he brought out the Asherah from the house of YHWH outside of Jerusalem to the valley of Kidron, and he burned it in the valley of Kidron, and ground it to powder, and cast its dust upon the graves of the common people* [Heb. *sons of the people*]. The v. is sequel to v.⁴. The *Asherah* was 'the graven image of the Asherah' of 21⁷; *cf.* I. 15¹³ for Asa's removal of the like 'abominable' object. The language used of its destruction is parallel to that for the fate of the golden calf, Ex. 32²⁰; the material, as in that case, was doubtless of wood with metal overlay, for which art *cf.* Dt. 7²⁵, Is. 30²², 40¹⁹. For the cemetery for the common people *cf.* the purchase of the Potter's Field, Mt. 27^{5ff.}. The passage indicates the early general use of this rocky ravine E of Jerusalem not only for tombs of royalty and gentry but also as a common cemetery. The valley was to become a place of burial 'for lack of room' according to Jer. 7^{31ff.}. The tradition was continued by the great Jewish cemetery on the western slope of the Mount of Olives, complemented by the Muslim cemetery on the eastern face. The valley thus became the prospected scene of the final resurrection and the judgment of the world, and so, as Eusebius records, the novel name of the Valley of Jehoshaphat came to be applied to it, taken from Joel 4² (Engl. 3²). And the lower stretch of the Kidron valley bears the Arabic name

Wady en-Nār, 'Valley of (Hell-) Fire'; cf. Note to v.⁴. See Smith, *Jerusalem*, I, bk. I, ch. 7; Baedeker's *Pal. and Syria*, 72 ff.; Montgomery, 'The Holy City and Gehenna,' *JBL* 27 (1908), 24 ff.; and for the Arabic tradition G. Le Strange, *Palestine under the Moslems*, 218 ff. 7. *And he broke down the houses of the sacred-prostitutes in (the area of) the house of YHWH, where the women wove robes [ἱ] houses, EVV hangings/tents/coverings—see Note] for the Asherah.* For this depraved class, including both men and women (the word masc. here, as covering both sexes, and so the usual tr. here, 'sodomites,' is inexact), see Comm. on I. 14²⁴. For women in the temple see Eze. 8¹⁴, and cf. the 'women's house' (*bit aštammi*) as a dependency of Babylonian temples (Meissner, *Bab. u. Ass.*, 2, 69; Bezold, *Glossar*, 79). For ritual vestments woven by women in the Babylonian temples see C. L. Woolley, *Antiquaries' Journal*, 5, 393 (cited by Robinson, *HI* I, 419), and cf. the notice of such elaborate garments given by Lucian, *De Dea Syra*, 42. Gressmann (cited above) gives (pp. 325 ff.) several illustrative cases from the Greek field bearing upon these Oriental practices: a priestess who was *περιράπτρια*, 'dressmaker,' another *κοσμητήρια*, 'adorner,' etc. VV.^{8a. 9} manifestly belong together, and like v.⁵ are out of place here. 8a. *And he brought in all the priests from the cities of Judah, and he defiled the high-places where the priests burned incense, from Geba to Beer-sheba.* For Geba as the northern boundary of Judah see I. 15²². 'Priests' here is in contrast to 'priestlings,' v.⁵, but both are characterized as 'incense-burners.' 9. *Only the priests of the high-places (cf. I. 12^{31. 32}) were not coming up to (i.e., serving at) the altar of YHWH in Jerusalem, but they ate unleaven among their brethren.* The provincial priests, now without local duty and support, were brought to Jerusalem, evidently for restraint and stipend; cf. Dt. 18^{6ff.}. For the extreme of degradation to which they were subjected from a later point of view see Eze. 44^{10ff.}. It is to be noted that these country clergy are called priests, not Levites, as Dt. has made the innovation. The eating of 'unleaven' remains a problem. Kittel and Šanda connect the reference with the subsequent Passover celebration (vv.^{21ff.}). Kuenen's emendation to 'portions,' revision of the spelling of 'unleaven,' adjudged by Stade as 'not impossible,' is accepted positively

by Gressmann (p. 327; cf. Eissfeldt). But such an early corruption of the familiar word is unaccountable, unless by intentional perversion. It may well be a technical term; those who might eat of the Paschal food were *ipso facto* admitted to all sacred foods; and so Rashi interprets. **8b.** *And he broke down the high-places of the gates at the entrance of the gate of Joshua, commandant of the city, at one's left in the city-gate:* a most puzzling statement; with several *gate high-places* appearing at one spot! But true historical notes are preserved in the naming of the commandant Joshua (for the title cf. I. 22²⁶), and the exact location of the objects. A. Geiger's and G. Hoffman's ingenious proposition (*ZAW* 2, 175) to read *satyrs* in place of *gates* with change of two pointings in 𐤀 , has been generally accepted. The word, also occurring at Lev. 17⁷, 2 Ch. 11¹⁵, Is. 13²¹, 34¹⁴, is translated with 'devils' by AV, 'he-goats' by RVV, 'satyrs' by JV. It might be best expressed in English with 'hobgoblins.' For such uncanny beings see Duhm, *Die bösen Geister im A.T.* (1904), 46 ff. The term is to be interpreted as a scoffing allusion to the debased ancient deities, as in the cited passages of Lev. and Ch. **10.** *And he defiled (the) Topheth in the vale of Ben-Hinnom [=K̄r.; Kt. bnê-H.], that one should not pass his son and daughter in the fire to (the) Melek [the King; 𐤀 the Molek, EVV Molech].* For etymology of 'Topheth,' still dubious, see Lexx., BDD, Smith, *Jerusalem*, I, 197. For the deity see Comm. on I. 11⁷, according to which his sanctuary was 'in the mount before Jerusalem.' The barbarous cult is condemned by the contemporary Dt. (12³¹), and the unholy site execrated by Jer. (7^{29ff.}, 19); for a recent study see Torrey, *Pseudo-Ezekiel* (1930), ch. 3. For the *vale*, Heb. *gê*, in contrast to *naḥal*, 'wady,' used of the Kidron Valley, see Smith, vol. I, bk. 1, ch. 7, locating it on the south side of Jerusalem, and so in contradiction to the tradition identifying it with the Kidron valley, which became the seat of the apocalyptic Gehenna; see above on v. 6. **11.** *And he put away the horses which the kings of Judah had given to the sun at the entrance of the house of YHWH, by the chamber of Nathan-melek the chamberlain [or eunuch], which was in the precincts; and the chariot [with Gr.; 𐤀 pl.] of the sun he burned with fire.* VV.^{11. 12} connect logically with vv.^{4. 5b}. For the sun's chariot Dussaud *cf.*

(*RHR* 1931, 359, n. 2) the Akk. title of the sun, *rāḫib narkabti*, 'chariot-rider,' and the name of a deity at Senjirli, *Rkb-El*, 'Driver of El.' Graham and May cite (*Culture and Conscience*, 235, n. 2) an Akk. text detailing the 'charioteer of the deity,' and 'the sacred stable,' as also 'the sacred procession.' For an Assyrian relief exhibiting the procession of the gods, mounted on animals, one of them, presumably the sun, on a horse, see Jastrow, *Bildermappe zur Religion Babylonien u. Assyriens* (1912), fig. 98; Gressmann, *ATB* 2, pl. cxxxv; cf. Rostovtzeff, 'Dieux et chevaux' (presenting bronze figurines), *Syria*, 1931, 48 ff. See also Gressmann, *ZAW* 1924, 323, n. 6; Langdon, *Semitic Mythology*, 54; F. J. Hollis in *Myth and Ritual* (S. H. Hooke ed.), Essay 5; H. G. May, 'Some Aspects of Solar Worship at Jerusalem,' *ZAW* 1937, 269 ff. For the naming of *the chamber of N. Šanda* cf. a similar personal tradition in the Mosque el-Aḳsa. For the officer's ambiguous title cf. 18¹⁷, 25¹⁹. For the word translated *precincts*, see Note. **12.** *And the altars on the roof—the upper chamber of Ahaz—that the kings of Judah had made, and the altars that Manasseh had made in the two courts of the house of YHWH, did the king break down, and he 'broke them up there' [so with correction of impossible 𐤁—see Note], and he cast their dust on the Kidron valley.* For this definite datum of stellar worship, expanding v. 5, cf. Zeph. 1⁵ (see Horst, *HAT*, *ad loc.*), Jer. 19¹³ (on the worship addressed to the host of heaven), and 32²⁹ (with Baal as object). The appositional phrase, *the upper chamber of Ahaz*, is regarded as secondary by Kittel, Stade; but even so, it is a worthy historical gloss. Cf. Ahaz's innovations recorded in 16^{10ff.}, and *n.b.* his sun-dial (20¹¹); Šanda suggests reference to an observatory. The brief record is brilliantly illuminated by the Ugaritic legend (Gordon, *Ugar. Handbook*, 2, *Keret*), in which (lines 73 ff.) the hero is divinely bidden to ascend to the top of the tower, there to raise his hands towards the heavens, and to sacrifice to the Bull and to Baal, Ben-Dagan; his action in response is presented in identical terms below (lines 165 ff.). The notice of Manasseh's altars is citation of 21⁵. **13.** *And the high-places in front of Jerusalem on the right hand of the Mount of Destruction [with sarcastic play on the original word 'oil,' i.e., the Mount of Olives], which Solomon king of Israel built to Ashtart*

[**A** *Ashtoreth*] *god(dess)* [**H** *abomination*] of *Sidonia*, and to *Chemosh god* [**H** *abomination*] of *Moab*, and to *Milkom god* [**H** *detestation*] of the *Bnê-Ammon*, did the king defile. For these pagan sanctuaries see Comm. on I. 11^{5a}, of which this v. is pure repetition, with the additional note of their location at the southern end of the Mount of Olives. **14.** *And he broke in pieces the pillars, and cut down the Asherahs, and filled their place with men's bones:* another generalizing addition.

The specific details in the above confused account give clue to original materials. Of this order are, v.⁴, altars of Baal and Asherah; v.⁶, destruction of the Asherah-image; v.⁷, the sacred prostitutes' quarters; v.^{8b}, the satyr high-places; v.¹¹, horses and chariot of the sun; v.¹², the stellar altars. Of the remainder, vv.⁵. ^{8a}. ⁹ concern the disposition of the provincial priests, v.⁵ indeed conflicting with vv.^{8a}. ⁹; v.¹⁰, on the Melek-cult, is out of place, and may be secondary, as are vv.¹³. ¹⁴. Cf. the afterthought of the diviners below, v.²⁴.

VV.¹⁵⁻²⁰. The reformation outside of Judah. This passage of generalities, dependent upon the midrash in I. 13, is in absolute contrast to the historical details of vv.⁴⁻¹⁴. The desecration of the altar at Bethel may well be historical, but the murder of the priests of the high-places contradicts the treatment of the priestlings in v.⁵. **15.** *And moreover the altar at Bethel [the high-place which Jeroboam ben Nebat made, who entailed sin on Israel, moreover that altar and the high-place] he destroyed, and he 'broke up its stones' [so at least the Grr., replacing impossible **H** burnt the high-place]—he stamped to dust; and he burned Asherah.* Omission of the long bracketed section is necessary to reduce a most conflate passage (following SBOT). An altar can be destroyed, but hardly a high-place; in the Jeroboam story the altar alone is the offensive object, references to high-places appearing there only in I. 12³¹, 13³². ³³. The Grr. give at least a makeshift in place of the impossible burning of a high-place. The final reference to Asherah (here exceptionally without the article) is evidently secondary. **16.** *And Josiah faced about, and he saw the tombs that were there in the mount, and he gave orders, and took the bones from the tombs, and burned them upon the altar, and defiled it, according to the word of YHWH that the man of God*

proclaimed, [when Jeroboam stood at the Haj by the altar ; and he faced about, and cast his eyes upon the tomb of the man of God¹ [plus from Grr.], who proclaimed these things. The insertion from the Gr., itself clumsy, or the like is necessary, H showing the result of parablepsis due to the double occurrence of the *man of God*. The original may have been simply : *And Josiah faced about, and he saw the tombs that were there in the mount, and he cast his eyes upon the tomb of the man of God, who proclaimed these things.* 17. *And he said : What is that monument that I see?* For such a traditional sepulchral monument (*ṣīyūn*, the word also at Eze. 39¹⁵), in modern Arabic the tomb of a *walī* (saint), cf. Rachel's 'pillar,' Gen. 35²⁰ (with another word *maṣṣebet*, as used in Phœn.). *And the men of the city said to him : The tomb !—The man of God who came from Judah, and proclaimed these things that thou hast done.* The initial exclamatory phrase is to be left despite critics ; translations, e.g., G^L EVV, naturally fill it out (see Note). 18. *And he said : Let him be ; none move his bones ! And they left his bones alone, the bones of the prophet who came from Samaria.* The final clause is an absurd bit of carelessness, as the prophet came from Judah. G^L has a long insertion, introducing the elder prophet of the original midrash ; but even he did not come from Samaria. 19. *And moreover all the high-place houses in the cities of Samaria, which the kings of Israel had made for provocation, Josiah removed, and he did to them in accordance with all the things he had done at Bethel.* 20. *And he sacrificed all the priests of the high-places, who were there, on the altars, and he burned men's bones upon them.* Notice of the *high-place houses* repeats I. 12³¹. V. 20 repeats I. 13².

VV.²¹⁻²³. The great Passover celebration in Jerusalem. 21. *And the king commanded all the people, to wit : Celebrate Passover to YHWH your God, as is written in this book of the covenant.* 22. *Indeed there was no celebration like this Passover since the days of the Judges, who judged Israel, and for all the days of the kings of Israel and of Judah.* 23. *Just in the eighteenth year of king Josiah was this Passover celebrated to YHWH in Jerusalem.* The Passover was apparently chosen for this climax because it was the most distinctive Israelite feast, with the sacrifice of a lamb, distinctly nomadic and

pastoral in character, and so peculiarly Judæan, the North Israelite element supplying the requirement of unleaven. Cf. Dt. 16^{1a}, and see Morgenstern in *HUCA* 10 (1935), 43 ff. Hempel finds here the statesmanlike combination of the festivals of the two regions (*Altheb. Lit.*, 142). The intensity of the reformation appears in the choice of the Passover for this demonstration, as that feast was one primarily of the family group, hence heretofore celebrated throughout the whole land. N. M. Nicolsky, in 'Pascha im Kulte des jerusalem. Tempels,' *ZAW* 1927, 171 ff., argues reasonably that this event was the innovating institution of a Passover Haj to the temple. Cf. the amplifications of this brief datum in 2 Ch. 35¹⁻¹⁹, 1 Esd. 1¹⁻²². The awkward repetition of the date as *in the eighteenth year* (cf. 22³) appears secondary, an attempt to make the event initial in the reformation.

V.²⁴. A summary account of the purgation of various heathenish rites. For the ghostly rites as practised by Manasseh see Comm. on 21⁶. For the *teraphim*, household gods, see Gressmann, *ZAW* 1924, 324 ff., and for the Akkadian background Sidney Smith, *Rev. d'Ass.*, 23 (1923), 127 ff.; *JTS* 1932, 33 ff.; and C. H. Gordon, *RB* 44 (1935), 35 ff.

VV.²⁵⁻²⁷. The moralizing judgment. **25.** *And like him there was not before him a king, who (so) turned to YHWH with all his heart and all his soul and all his strength according to all the Law of Moses, and after him arose none like him.* Josiah's piety is expressed in terms of the Shema (Dt. 6⁴), with its tripartite analysis of human nature, the intelligence, the feelings, the moral action. The statement contradicts the similar encomium given to Hezekiah (18⁵). The one contemporary encomium of Josiah is from Jeremiah's hand (22^{15, 16}), but only lauding him as a just king (see Add. Note, n. 4). The encomium is given here, it would be out of place in connexion with the story of his tragic death. **26.** *Only YHWH turned not from the heat of his great anger, even as his anger was hot against Judah for all the provocations with which Manasseh provoked him.* **27.** *And YHWH said: Also Judah will I remove from my face, even as I removed Israel, and I will reject this city which I have chosen, Jerusalem, and the house of which I said, My Name shall be there.* As history proved, the reformation was not sufficient to thwart the original divine decree

(21^{10ff.}). 28. The usual formula of *the rest of the acts*, etc., is exceptionally placed before note of the king's death.

VV.^{29. 30}. The tragic end of the reign. For the history see Add. Note, §1. 29. *In his days Pharaoh-Necho king of Egypt campaigned against the king of Assyria on the way to the river Euphrates; and king Josiah went to confront him. And he (Pharaoh) slew him at Megiddo, when he saw him. 30. And his servants drove him, a dead man, from Megiddo, and brought him to Jerusalem. And they buried him in his tomb. And the people of the land took Jehoahaz ben Josiah, and they anointed him, and made him king in his father's stead.* 2 Ch. 35²⁰ (*cf.* 1 Esd. 1²³⁻³¹) makes Necho's objective Karkemish, but this is taken from the note, Jer. 46², of his subsequent campaign in 605 B.C. The identity of this Megiddo has been long in dispute. Herodotus reports (ii, 159): "Necho, meeting the Syrians at Magdol, conquered them, and after the battle took Kadytis, a great city of Syria." Magdol is the Biblical Migdol on the Egyptian frontier (Ex. 14², Eze. 29¹⁰, *cf.* Abel, *GP* 2, 387); Kadytis has been identified with Gaza; *cf.* Jer. 47¹. However, as now generally recognized, Magdol, better known to Herodotus, replaced the name Megiddo; see Kittel, *GVI* 2, 417, n. 1, proposing also that Kadytis is Syrian, presumably Kadesh. Megiddo (*cf.* I. 9¹⁵) was the capital of the Assyrian district of Lower Galilee, which had now come into Josiah's hands.¹ It was at this strategic point that Josiah chose to meet the invader upon his entrance into the valley of Esdraelon. For the battle, in which he met his death, Ch. has a detailed and probably true tradition, which Jos. repeats (*Ant.*, x, 5, 1).² A novel view is that proposed by A. C. Welch, 'The Death of Josiah,' *ZAW* 1925, 255 ff., supported by Robinson (*HI* 424), that Josiah went 'to meet Necho' at the latter's summons, and that the latter, without further detail, 'killed him.' The

¹ See Forrer, *Die Provinzeinteilung des ass. Reiches*, 27. Gressmann suggests (*ZAW* 1924, 336, n. 1) that 'Megiddo' is abbreviation of 'Migdól-'él,' which might account for Herodotus's place-name. For disruption of the traditional identification of Megiddo with Armageddon of Rev. 16¹⁶ see Torrey, 'Armageddon,' *HTR* 31 (1936), 237 ff., showing that the basis of the latter name is 'har mô'éd' of Is. 14¹³. For literature on Megiddo see Comm., I. 9¹⁵.

² See, especially for the parallel, B. Alfrink, 'Die Schlacht bei Megiddo u. der Tod des Josias (609),' *Biblica*, 15 (1934), 173 ff.

Hebrew statement is certainly terse beyond comparison ; yet the tragedy obscured all details to local historians. The military phrase ' to meet ' is used elsewhere (*e.g.*, Jos. II²⁰), and ' to face the antagonist ' was a knightly expression (*cf.* I4⁸. 11). *The people of the land* chose the successor, even as they had acted earlier upon similar tragedies of the throne (ch. II, 2I²⁴) ; see further Comm. on v.³¹.

Burkitt's Aquilanic Fragments appear for vv.^{11-15, 19-24, 24-27}.

1. ויאמרו : unless the verb is intransitive, it should be read as Nif. ; the rdg. by Ch., Grr. as sing. active with foll. acc. calls for the prep. את.—2. [ו]בל [ייעני] : Ch., T^w, of the Grr. B†, om.—as too extravagant ?—[י] בניית ביה, locative, as *e.g.*, v.²⁴—the older rdg.—3. [ו]לשטר] : 2 MSS, Ch., B† om.—4. הזהק הגדול : ש^h ✱, although in all Gr. MSS. For the adj. see Comm., 12¹¹, 22⁴⁻⁸.—כהני הטענה.—T the sing., and so at 25¹⁸, Jer. 52²⁴. For a possible similar Phœn. title see Harris, *Gram.*, 152, *s.v.* שני ; Lidzb. doubts the interpretation (*Eph.*, I, 248, n. 1) ; Eissf. accepts it (*ZAW* 1939, 6).—וישרבו : the pl. verb of ש^l ש is *ad sensum*.—בשרבות : Grr. transliterate, εν σαδημωθ (B† εν σαλημωθ ; *cf.* ש^h), exc. ש^l εν τω εμπυρισμω (+τ. χειμαρρον), and so Sym. (*cf.* Rahlfs, *SS* 3, 248) ; ש^l פ ' in the valley,' T ' in the plain,' EVV ' in the fields.' See Note on 19²⁶, where שרבה=שרבה of Is. ; but there are neither fields nor plains in that deep canyon. The word appears in Jer. 31⁴⁰, but miswritten שרבות, in similar connexion, ' the whole valley of the dead bodies and the ashes and הני unto the Wady Kidron ' ; the word in question is here again generally translated ' fields,' but see Graf, *ad loc.*, properly denying the pertinency. The interpretation of ש^l in both places is to the point, with שרם=שרף, ' to burn,' or better still, with rdg. of Sin for Shin, and so relating the root to that of קרב, ' the burnt city,' even as גברה is the ' sunken city ' (Arab. root *gamara*, see Montg., *JQR* 25 [1935], 262). The word refers to the garbage fires in the valley, making it ultimately infamous as Gehenna ; *cf.* Comm. above. Klost., Kamph., Ehrl. would read משרבות, ' lime-kilns.'—וניהא : for the irregular consecution *cf.* the cases in vv.^{6, 8, 10, 15} ; Hölscher and Horst find critical basis in these cases for secondary character of the section (see Gressmann, *ZAW* 1924, 317, n. 2).—5. והשבת : T correctly tr. with בנייל ; פ ' destroyed,' ש^h א ' killed ' ; original rdg. of S, καταπανσεν, preserved only by MS g and Aq., otherwise corrupted into κατακαυσεν=ש^h א, an error suggested by v.²⁰.—כטריום : the word appears in the contemporary Zeph. I⁴, and in Hos. 10⁵ ; earlier in Amarna tablets (*kamiru*), Egyptian (*kumru*) ; Phœn. and Punic כטר (in the Punic inscr. in parallelism with בתן, Harris, *Gram.*, 111) ; Oaram. (two Nerab. inscriptions, ' to X priest of the Moon '—Lidzb., *HNE* 445 ; Cooke, *NSI* nos. 64, 65) ; the Elephantine papp. (of priests of an Egyptian god) ; Nabatean,

Palmyrene (Lidzb., *ib.*, 297); Minæan (D. H. Müller, *Südarab. Allertümer*, 1899, 29; OArab. (C. Landberg, *Daḡīna*, 1905-13, 965). For the most recent treatment see Albr., *SAC* 178, and notes. Mowinckel has attempted etymology, as 'der Heisse,' *i.e.*, 'machtbegabt' (*ZAW* 1916, 238 f.); see also Dhorme, *RHR* 108 (1938), 118.—ויקטר: ⚡^l ⚡^h ⚡^h read as ויקטר; other Gr. ⚡^h ⚡^h = ויקטר; the former is the preferable correction, and so EVV *sotto voce*. Gressmann (*ib.*, 326) would elide ירושלם . . . ויקטר as 'anstössig.' The Piel is used only of false worship.—מולות: properly 'stations'; *cf.* Phœn. לימול נעם = ἀγαθῆ ῥύχη (Harris, *ib.*, 123). Gr. in general transliterate, with resultant corruptions, most correctly ⚡^h; Aq., 'zodiacal constellations'; MS i 'stars'; MS p, 'the zodiacal signs.' Šanda gives an extensive study of Akk. *manzallu*.—6. קבר = ⚡^h ⚡^h ⚡^h; other VSS by necessity of translation as pl.; but the construct phrase has pl. sense, *cf.* בית הבמות, 17²⁹.—7. בתי הקרישים: all Gr., ⚡^h as 'בית הק'; ק is common gender, *cf.* the collective קריש, I. 22⁴⁷.—[לאשרה]: ⚡^h ⚡^h ⚡^h transliterate, most texts having χερτιειμ/ν, but by error for βερτιειμ, as in x y, Theodoret; ⚡^l Quinta, στολας = Lucif., 'ad stolas.' The Gr. transliteration has suggested to Klost., *al.*, Benz., *al.*, קפנים, 'tunics,' but the spelling χ- is secondary to β-, as Kit. observes. Šanda ingeniously connects the noun with Arab. *batt*, 'woven garment' (and so G. R. Driver, *JBL* 55 [1936], 107), which interpretation is to be accepted, the corresponding Heb. root בוד representing the Arab. with voiced dentals after b, and so ⚡^h ⚡^h tr.—8. שטה: for use of the form, which St. would correct, *cf.* Eze. 48³⁵, etc., and Arab. *tamma*.—נבע: B i Γαιβαλ = ⚡^h; most Hex. MSS, *e.g.*, N, have replaced with 'Dan.'—[באר]: ער: 19 MSS וער = Gr., ⚡^h ⚡^h ⚡^h.—[השערים]: במות ⚡^h ⚡^h = בית; Klost., *al.* would read קפת.—השערים: the correction accepted in Comm. would read השערים.—איש בשער: ⚡^l ⚡^h read as though איש בא שער, accepted by many critics (*e.g.*, BH), but such translation is interpretative.—9. טעות: Kuenen's emendation to קניח, 'portions,' is attractive, but arbitrary; see Kit., St., who leave the text with a question-mark.—10. התפת: against the artificial Kṛ. (*cf.* 'Molek') note the Gr. transliterations, *e.g.*, ταφεθ (B *al.*), θεφωθ (x y = ⚡^h), θοφθα (A†).—[הנס]: Kṛ. קן, and so 50 MSS Ken., deR. = VSS; elsewhere similar variations between Kt. and Kṛ.; a variant form, Josh. 18¹⁶ om. בן. The name הנטי appears on a Judæan seal, *IAE* 246.—לבית: 2 MSS deR. om. = OGr. (B *al.*), some Luc. MSS, Hex. (⚡^h ✕), ⚡^h ⚡^h; it appears to conflict with the prep. in foll. להעביר, (4 MSS העביר), but *cf.* למען ל', Eze. 21²⁰; the negative was probably introduced to express the royal intention (*cf.* St. BH).—11. קבא = 'from entering'; but קבא or בקבא must be read, as also implied by VSS EVV.—[לשבת]: אל: so all MSS = Gr., ⚡^h; ⚡^h 'iuxta,' EVV 'by,' as though על, which is required.—פרוק: also in sing., פרוק, 1 Ch. 26¹⁸. The latter form now appears, with mng. as here, for a temple precinct in the Lydian Aramaic inscr. published by

E. Littmann in *Sardis*, vol. 6, pt. 1 (1916); cf. S. A. Cook, *Journ. Hell. Studies*, 1917, 77 ff., 219 ff.; Torrey, *AJSL* 34 (1918), 185 ff., and at length P. Kahle and P. Sommer in *Kleinasiatische Forschungen*, vol. I (ed. by Sommer and H. Eheloff, 1930), 18 ff. For etymology as Persian see *SBOT*, GB. But a Bab. etymology has been proposed by T. Östreicher, p. 54, accepted by Gressmann, p. 323, and Procksch, p. 27 (for the titles see Add. Note, §2), identifying with Sumerian *ē-bar-bar*, 'shining house,' name of sun-temples at Sippar, Babylon, etc. (Deimel, *Pantheon Bab.*, no. 3081). This etymology would obviate St.'s criticism of the word here as late because of Persian origin, but it is not used in the Bible of the temple but of its courts, as also in later Jewish use, and there also for 'suburbs' (Jastrow, *Dict.*, 1218). VSS transliterate, exc. that Sym. Græcizes the transliteration into τ. φρουρόν, 'the guard.'—מרכבות: MSS 1, 253 מרכבות: 𐤄 𐤄^H 𐤀 as sing.=מַרְכָּבָה, to be accepted with St., *al.*—12. על הגג עליית אהו: see Comm.; Šanda would elide the art. to obtain construct construction.—[יהודה]: B 𐤁 Lucif. as sing. by corruption of βασιλεύς>-ευσ, and then of prec. ἐποιήσαν>-εν; 𐤄^L followed suit, intruding with 'Ahaz (king of Judah).'—וירץ משה: Aq. used a rare verb of active sense, ἐδρομωσεν; 𐤀 'cucurrit' (cf. mg. of EVV); other VSS, 'removed' (=GV), 𐤄 𐤄^L with different verbs. Suggested emendations to וירצא (Benz., *al.*), 𐤄 𐤄^L (Ehrl., *al.*; cf. *BH*), with attachment of the foll. Mem to the verb have little textual basis. Kimchi suggested the verb וירץ 'to break up,' followed by FV EVV, and in suit correction to וירצא is most plausible. St. and Haupt come to no definite conclusion.—13. הבמה: Grr. (not Aq.), 𐤄^H as הבית.—[להר] המשהית: Grr. (not Aq.) transliterate=𐤄^H; 𐤀 ' (Montis) offensionis'; Aq., 𐤄 𐤀 as from root שחח, 'to destroy'; EVV 'destruction/corruption.' 𐤄 with 'Mount of Olives' gives the right clue=הר המזקה, 'Mount of (olive-) Oil'; the local application appears in the Mishna (Jastrow, *Dict.*, s.v. משהה), and such was the interpretation of Rashi, Kimchi. The original was early changed to the form here to verify Jer.'s prophecy (7³²) that the Kidron valley would be termed 'Valley of Slaughter' (הרגה). Piscator (in Poole) early recognized the play on the word, comparing Hos. 10⁶. The noun of 𐤄 was recognized by Midrash as a demon, 'the Destroyer' (Jastrow, s.v.).—שקן: bis; cf. I. 11⁶. 7; also here מלכם תועבת vs. 'מ' ש' there.—15. הבמה 10; secondary, as the asyndeton shows; the insertion duplicated with the plus below, ואת הבמה.—ואת הבמה=Aq., 𐤄 𐤀; Grr., κ. συστρεψεν τ. λιθους αυτου=𐤄 𐤄^H, which Klost. rendered into אַתְּאֶרְקֵיהָ for restoration of the original, followed by Burn., St., *al.*; cf. *BH* (Eissf. keeps 𐤄); 𐤄 is a possible textual corruption of the verb; but the original may have been a careless bit of writing.—16. בור: Grr. (exc. Aq., 𐤄^L), 𐤄^H, 'in the city,' as though בער.—See Comm. for acceptance of a long plus in Grr., 𐤄^H, proposed by Then., and accepted by almost all critics since; for the re-written Heb.

see *BH*.—17. הלו : also as fem. at 4²⁶; the story is in Northern dialect.—הקבר : for the absolute noun, as rendered above, cf. similar cases at 9²⁷ with corrected text, 22^{18b}, and see GK §167; cf. Wright, *Arab. Gr.*, 2, §35. Grr. om., exc. Aq., ⓪^L , the latter as though for הַקָּבֵר, which St. adopts; Benz., קבר +.—אשר עשית : Grr. (exc. Aq., ⓪^L), Ⓢ^H 'which he announced.'—[אל] התנבא בית : read either ב' קָנָה or ב' הַתְּנַבָּא, with ב' understood as locative (some MSS ב'ב), which construction was later ignored, and the K̄r. attempted the construct; for such cases of irregular K̄r. see GK §127, f. St. regards the unnecessary אל בית as a gloss.—18. ⓪^L adds to the v. a long exegetical plus, introducing 'the old prophet who dwelt at Bethel,' and 'the man of God from Judah'; see Rahlfs, SS 3, 279. St. retains Ⓢ^H , as vs. Burn., al. Ehrl. would read here, "and his bones saved the prophet of Samaria," but there is no reference to the other prophet.—19. להערים : Ⓢ^H corroborates Ⓢ^H ; the same absolute phrase at 21⁸.—20. אשר עש : Ⓢ^H Ⓢ^H interpret as אשר שמו, "who set incense" (i.e., upon the altar); cf. Dt. 33¹⁰ for such use of the verb.—את עצמות אדם : the particle את, which critics would elide, introduces the direct citation of I. 13².

21. הוה [כפזר הברית] : 2 MSS הוה = ⓪^L Aq., Ⓢ^H Ⓢ^H Ⓢ^H .— ⓪^L adds to the v., "and they did so," an example of translator's complement.—22. כפזר הוה : Grr. (not Ⓢ^H) = הפזר הוה, which St. prefers, as though there had been no Passover celebration in Judah since the Judges; but the point is the confinement of the celebration to Jerusalem.—וכל ימי מלכי ישראל ומלכי יהודה : acc. to Ⓢ^H the first phrase is an Aquilanic addition to orig. ⓪^L , but this leaves the second phrase in the air; the whole expression may be dependent on 2 Ch. 35¹⁸.—23. [הפזר] הוה : ⓪^L (B A al.) Ⓢ^H om.—24. ידענים, אבות : see Comm. on 21⁸.—25. [תורת] : ככל, בכל MSS.—26. [העשים] : כל : Grr., exc. ⓪^L , om.; Ⓢ^H has.—27. את ירושלם : noted by St. as 'scribal expansion'; but the city's name is parallel to the divine name of the temple.—29. פרעה נכה : Aimé-Giron has published an Eg. tomb inscr. naming פרעה נכו (*Anc. Egypt*, 1923, pt. 2, 38 ff.); the Gr. Νεχᾶω is closer to the Eg. name.—[יאשהו] : ⓪^L om.; Ⓢ^H ✕; but repetition of the title is in place.—כראתו איתו : Joüon (*Mél.*, 483) regards as dittogr. of לקראתו : but see Comm.—30. בקברתו : Hex. (N al., gloss in Ⓢ^H) + 'in the city of David.'

ADDITIONAL NOTE TO II. 22-23³⁰§1. THE INTERNATIONAL HISTORY¹

Josiah came to the throne in 639 B.C., when Ashurbanipal's empire was fast riding to its fall, in conflict with rebellious states, which

¹ See at large *CAH* 3, cc. 5, 9, 10, the Histories of Hall, ch. 11, Meyer, vol. 3, 139 ff.; for Assyria and Babylonia, Rogers, vol. 2, bk. 3, ch. 11, bk. 4, ch. 1, Olmstead, *HA* ch. 48; for Egypt, Petrie, vol. 3, 312 ff., Breasted, ch. 27, Alt, *Israel u. Aegypten*, 87 ff.; for Judah,

ultimately threw off the yoke, Media and Babylonia, the latter under Nabopolassar (*ca.* 609 B.C.), father of Nebuchadnezzar II, and in face of invading hordes of the northern Kimmerians and later the Scythians, the latter invasion probably in the notable year 626, the last sure dating for Ashurbanipal, and the year of the call of the prophet Jeremiah. For this last storm of barbarians, which swept as far as Egypt's borders, Herodotus gives a lengthy record (i, 103 ff.), while it is the background of prophecies of the contemporary Zephaniah and the young Jeremiah (Zeph. i, 2; Jer. 1³⁸ff., cc. 3-6, etc.).² The persistent combination of Media and Babylon brought Assyria to its end with the capture of Nineveh in the year 612, accompanied with the utter destruction of the capital and the neighbouring proud cities (*cf.* Nah. 2, 3). These two states now claimed and proceeded to divide the legacy of Assyria.

However there was a third nation, of far greater antiquity and imperial fame, which claimed its share of the spoils. Egypt had been conquered and despoiled by Ashurbanipal (*ca.* 660 B.C.). But there came the native revival under Psammetichos I (663-609) and his son Necho II (609-594). With the collapse of Assyria Egypt pressed again its ancient claims upon the Syrian coast-lands as far as the Euphrates. After the fall of Nineveh in 612 Necho advanced against the up-coming Neo-Babylonian empire, and Josiah met his death in opposing his progress through Israelite territory (608 B.C.). Our book records (23³³) Necho's subsequent sojourn at Syrian Riblah. But his control of Syria was ephemeral. There ensued the decisive battle with the crown-prince and future king of Babylon, Nebuchadnezzar II, at Karkemish in 605 (*cf.* the historical tradition at 2 Ch. 35²⁰), and the Pharaoh's empire was confined once more to Egypt. The decadent state of Judah became a pawn between the two empires.

The fresh Aryan nations were now entering upon the imperial map of south-western Asia. But before their time of empire arrived, occurred the spiritual revival of ancient Egypt and Babylonia, harking back to

Stade, vol. 1, 641 ff., Wellhausen, ch. 9, Sellin, vol. 1, 282 ff., Kittel, vol. 2, §49, Olmstead, *HPS* ch. 33, Robinson, vol. 1, ch. 20, Albright,

The seal of Eliakim and the Latest Pre-exilic History,' *JBL* 51 (1932), 77 ff. For the major historical event are to be consulted C. J. Gadd, 'The Fall of Nineveh,' *Proc. Brit. Acad.*, 11 (1923), E. Florit, 'Ripercussioni immediate della caduta di Ninive sulla Palestina,' *Biblica*, 1932, 399 ff. A collection of pertinent Akkadian and Egyptian texts is given by Jirku, *AKAT* 184 ff. J. Lewy's extensive monograph, *Forschungen zur alten Geschichte*, includes a section on 'Das Datum der Schlacht bei Megiddo und die Neubab. Synchronismen des A.T.,' with treatment of the Biblical texts (pp. 20 ff.) and presentation of Babylonian Chronicle G with commentary (pp. 68 ff.).

² For scepticism towards Herodotus's record of the Scythians and hence the removal of such a background for these prophecies see Eissf.'s argument in Horst's Comm. on Zeph. in *HAT* (1938), 184.

ancient times, in religion and art and literature. For Egypt see Breasted, ch. 27, and, succinctly, Meyer, 3, 149-51. The latter remarks that the foreign deity Seth was excluded from the pantheon, his name and statues obliterated, while the Syrian Anat and Astarte disappeared almost entirely—a close resemblance indeed to the Josianic reform! And similarly in Babylonia we find the revival of the religion and cult of the native god Marduk, along with the brilliant restoration of ancient sanctuaries; see A. Jeremias, *Monotheistische Strömungen innerhalb d. babylon. Religion* (1904), 23 ff., and Jastrow, *Rel. Bab. u. Ass.*, I, ch. 14, remarking (p. 251), "Man kann die neubabylonische Periode als eine ausgesprochen religiöse bezeichnen," and his *Religious Belief in Bab. and Ass.*, 99 ff., noting 'the tendency towards monotheism' in Marduk's absorption of the powers and attributes of the other gods. Hall, in the opening of his chapter, observes that "the effect of the Egyptian renovation was but to intensify and emphasize the old age of Egypt," and similarly, "the restored kingdom of Nabopolassar . . . was marked, like the restored kingdom of Psamatik, by a revival of old days and old ways. . . . And Nabonidus, the last king of the last Babylonian dynasty, was, as we shall see, a learned archæologist, an enthusiastic collector of ancient divine images, and energetic preserver of the most ancient temples." And Albright in his *From the Stone Age*, pp. 240 ff., gives a graphic view of this widespread wave of religious revival.

Judah in its repristination of traditional religion through the contemporary Deuteronomic reform was acting in consort with Egypt and Babylon for the national God and his people. Its action in part was of 'the spirit of the times.' But the document that underlay that reform was not archaizing, except in preservation of the proud traditional history; it was definitely prophetic, a programme for the future. And hence the permanent effect of the reformation for that people and its religion and for the world. Says Meyer (p. 158): "Dem Akt vom Jahre 621 stehen an Bedeutung wenig andere Begebenheiten der Weltgeschichte gleich: auf ihm beruht das Judentum und damit auch das Christentum wie der Islam." And Causse may be quoted in like strain (*Du groupe ethnique*, 175): "C'était un grand révolutionnaire que l'auteur de cette législation, un des plus grands révolutionnaires qui furent jamais. . . . Un point particulièrement significatif . . . c'est la manière dont s'effectue dans sa législation ce passage du collectivisme primitif à l'individualisme et à la religion intérieure que les prophètes de l'époque précédente avaient annoncés."

§2. THE BOOK FOUND IN THE TEMPLE

For the identity of the book found and its relation to Deuteronomy, a problem also involving the criticism of the book of Jeremiah, little more than reference may be made to the rapidly accumulating literature on the subject, in particular within the past two decades. Pfeiffer has presented an analytical bibliography for publications between 1914 and 1925 in his article, 'The History, Religion and Literature of

Israel,' *HTR* 27 (1934), 308 ff. There are to be noted the studies, with bibliographies, in the recent Introductions: Hempel, pp. 138 ff., Oesterley and Robinson, pp. 51 ff., Eissfeldt, §§22, 32, Pfeiffer, pp. 178 ff., with bibliography, pp. 867 ff. Two comprehensive treatments of recent date have appeared, with full bibliographies and criticism of the earlier literature: a Symposium on 'The Problem of Deuteronomy,' in *JBL* 47 (1928), 305-79, with discussion of the various date-themes, by J. A. Bewer, L. B. Paton, G. Dahl; and A. R. Siebens, *L'Origine du code deutéronomique* (1928, pp. 251 ff.). Subsequent additions to the bibliography with digests are given by W. Baumgartner, *Theol. Rundschau*, 1929, 7 ff.; A. Causse, in *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses*, 1933, 1 ff., and *Du groupe ethnique*, ch. 5; A. Lods, *Les prophètes d'Israël et le début du judaïsme* (1935), 157 ff.; W. A. Irwin, 'An Objective Criterion for the Dating of Deut.,' *AJSL* 56 (1939), 337 ff. Noteworthy for the historical relations are: Östreicher, *Das deuteronomische Gesetz* (1923); Gressmann, 'Josia u. das Deut.,' *ZAW* 1924, 313 ff.; Procksch, 'König Josia,' *Festgabe Th. Zahn* (1928), 19 ff.; Sellin, *Gesch. d. isr.-jüd. Volkes*, I, 289 ff.; Kittel, *GVI* 2, Beil. II; Robinson, *HI* I, Note F, pp. 424 ff.; also Dhorme, *L'Évolution religieuse d'Israël*, I, 45 ff.

For the several theories concerning the origin of the book only brief references may be given here. Practically Mosaic origin has been claimed by H. M. Wiener in a series of articles in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1907 et seq.; H. Junker, *Das Buch Deut.* (1933); J. Reider, in *JQR* 27 (1937), 349 ff. Most recently F. Dornseiff has argued for early composition of Dt. and D at large in the Pentateuch—for D a date ca. 830 B.C. ('Antikes zum A.T., 4: Die Abfassungszeit des Pentateuchs u. die Deuteronomiumsfrage,' *ZAW* 1938, 64 ff., e.g., p. 84). The theory of a Post-Exilic date has been propounded by G. R. Berry, *JBL* 39 (1920), 44 ff.; 59 (1940), 133 ff.; R. H. Kennett, *Deut. and the Decalogue* (1920); and most elaborately by G. Hölscher, 'Komposition u. Ursprung des Deuteronomiums,' *ZAW* 40 (1922), 161-255. For a comparatively early production, at least of the code in the book, argument has been made, *inter al.*, by Östreicher, *op. cit.*, A. C. Welch, *The Code of Deut.* (1924). Dhorme assigns the date of the book to the beginning of the seventh century or perhaps the end of the eighth. Irwin (*op. cit.*) denies the view of Post-Exilic origin, but remains uncertain as to the upper limit. As often with the composition of such programmatic theses, the dark age before the dawn is to be preferred for the origin of Dt.; there may be noted the avoidance of political subjects, with only brief reference to the monarchy. The book 'found' would be limited, as generally allowed by conservative critics, to cc. 5, 12-16, 28. Pfeiffer, in his *Int.*, 187, would extend this quantum to 4⁴⁴⁻⁸²⁰, 10¹²⁻¹¹²⁵, 12-26, 28¹⁻²⁴, 43-46. 89. There is to be noted Driver's still standard study of Dt. in his *Int.*, §5.

For the deposit and subsequent discovery of ancient temple archives, comparable with the present history, E. Naville

first drew attention for Egypt in his article, 'Egyptian Writings in Foundation Walls and the Age of the Book of Deuteronomy,' *PSBA* 29 (1907), 232 ff. Similar references are found in Akkadian and Hittite records, citations of which are given by Jirku, *AKAT* 184 ff. But the book in question was not a foundation deposit; rather it was a document laid away in the temple library, perhaps for safe-keeping, even as such libraries existed in ancient temples. The book was, literally speaking, a pseudograph, although without a title in the modern sense of the word, and hence it is variously referred to, as 'the book of the Law,' 'the book of the Covenant,' 'the words of this Covenant written in this book' (II. 22⁸, 23²⁻³). Moses' name is attached in the postscript, Dt. 31²⁴. *N.b.* Driver's apologetic for this ancient literary device of attribution to an ancient author, *Deut.*, pp. lv, *seq.*, and W. R. Smith, *The O.T. in the Jewish Church*, 363 ('not a forgery'). The composer may have had himself in mind with the words at 18¹⁸: "I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren like unto thee" (*cf.* v.¹⁵—this in antagonism to the cults and prophets denounced). The book was a Utopian religious programme (Hempel, 'eine heilsprophetische Programmschrift').

The story of the finding of the book is the most detailed narrative in Ki., apart from stories of the prophets, since the history of Solomon. The petty details of the event, the personalities of the royal commission, in particular of 'Huldah the prophetess,' are striking proof of a story of real history (this *vs.* Winckler, *KAT* 277). It is a woman, not the priest Hilkiah, or another of the priests, or one of the many prophets of the day (*e.g.*, Zephaniah, Jeremiah), who gives the oracle on the event. The priest himself appears clear of connivance with the origin of the book in his resolve to appeal to a non-sacerdotal prophetess. By the latter the dynasty, as embodying the people, is denounced to the extreme; only with a second oracle, following Josiah's act of repentance, is he promised a death 'in peace' (22²⁰), a promise contradicted by his tragic death. Reliance may not be attributed to the report of the prophetess's words, but the alleged promise must have been anterior to the actual end. Also there is in Dt. no partisanship for the Davidic monarchy, no reference to the

promises to David ; for the first time in history we learn of a monarchy, which, if it is to be established, is to be constitutional : " He shall write him a copy of this law in a book," and " he shall read therein all the days of his life . . . that his heart be not lifted up above his brethren " (17^{18ff.}). Also of the primacy of Judah there is no hint. Similarly in the immediately following Law of the Priests (18¹⁻⁸), these are ' the priests, the Levites,' and the provincial Levites shall have full privilege, if they come up to the sanctuary. There is not a word about Sadokids, high-priesthood and the like, nor is Jerusalem named ; there is only the indirect reference to " the place which YHWH shall choose." In literary style and theological character, in the line of the Elohist, the book may well have proceeded from a North Israelite, who had grasped in his convictions the historically proven necessity of a central sanctuary. We may compare the Prophet of Islam. The old Prophets of the North and Hosea had left a spiritual legacy to the South.

§3. THE REFORMATION ³

The narrative in ch. 23 presents specific events almost only for Jerusalem and Judah (' from Geba to Be~~er~~-sheba '). The destruction of the altar at Bethel, while wholly probable, is involved in a lengthy midrash. The original material is interspersed with later intrusions. V.^{5a}, with contemptuous reference to ' the priestlings at the high-places,' contradicts the generous treatment given to ' the priests of the high-places,' according to v.⁹. The summary of the stellar cults in v.^{6b}, while of contemporary flavour, is clumsily introduced. Both v.⁶ and v.⁸ interrupt the sequence of events in the purging of the temple, as does also v.¹⁰ with its datum on Topheth. V.¹³ is reproduction of I. 11^{5ff.} ; v.²⁴ is an afterthought, with 21⁶ in mind.

As for the progress of the reform, which Ki. presents as one act, culminating in a great Passover festival, the fuller data of Ch. have been accepted by some scholars for defining certain stages in the process. According to 2 Ch. 34³, " in the eighth year of his reign . . . he began to seek after the God of his father David ; and in the twelfth year he began to purge Judah and Jerusalem," etc. There follows

³ For recent criticism of the material in the composite story in ch. 23, along with mutual criticism, see Hölscher, ' Das Buch der Könige,' 206 ff., Östreicher, Gressmann, Kittel, Procksch, and *cf.* SBOT. Östreicher discovers two narratives, belonging severally to the two epochs that he assigns to the reformation. The data of the ch. are closely related to those in ch. 21, which gives the background of the present story.

(vv.⁸ⁿ.) 'in his eighteenth year,' the discovery of 'the book of the Law of YHWH given by Moses,' continued by the story of the covenant of king and people, this leading up to the fulsome story of the great Passover (35¹⁻¹⁹). These epochal data are accepted by Östreicher (*e.g.*, pp. 63 ff.), Procksch (pp. 20 ff.), and therewith a means of chronological analysis is claimed, chiming in with historical events; *e.g.*, the king's twelfth year, 628 B.C., would be contemporaneous with the end of the known history of Ashurbanipal, the inroad of the Scythians, while the call of Jeremiah was approximate, in the thirteenth year. But the 'conversion' of the young king, *ætat.* 16, *i.e.*, at his coming of age, appears artificial.⁴ The immediate purgation of the whole land of Israel along with specification of certain tribe-lands follows, vv.⁶⁻⁷, although according to 2 Ch. 34³¹⁻³² only the citizens of Jerusalem and Benjamin took part in making a covenant before YHWH, so inconsistent is the story.

As for the spiritual progress of the reformation, apart from destruction of the heathenish cults and sanctuaries, we are left entirely in the dark. The prophets appear in the great act of the Covenant (v.²—there is no reason to excise the reference). Sellin has proposed the extravagant theory (p. 291) that the provincial priests were brought up to Jerusalem to learn the Law, and so to be sent forth as missionaries, 'as curates of souls and teachers of Torah.' The question of the relation of Jeremiah to the reform belongs primarily to the criticism of the book assigned to him. The discovery of the book occurred in the fifth year of his ministry (Jer. 1²). According to 11¹ⁿ Jeremiah was one of the preachers of 'the words of this covenant,' with initial stress on the curse lying upon those who 'hear not the words of this covenant,' and so preaching to 'the men of Judah and the citizens of Jerusalem,' and 'in the streets of Jerusalem.' But while our history records the prophets as abetting Josiah, and names a prophetess as a cardinal actor, it ignores Jeremiah. This omission is not cause for stringent criticism. But more remarkable is Jeremiah's entire ignoring of Josiah, with the one exception in his indirect reference to him in the threnody over his son and successor Shallum (22¹¹ⁿ): "Did not thy father eat and drink and execute justice and right? Then it was well with him. He judged the cause of the poor and needy. Then it was well. Is not this to know me?" And apart from ch. 11 there is no reference to the reform. The problem of this offishness of the prophet has long been a troubled subject of discussion.⁵ Uniquely Torrey, holding to the late, pseudepigraphical origin of Ezekiel, and

⁴ The point would be made by the Chronicler that the young Josiah knew the Law, even if the original Book had been lost. For criticism of the above hypothesis see Gressmann, pp. 313 ff.

⁵ See, *e.g.*, Cheyne, *Jeremiah, His Life and Times* (ca. 1888), ch. 5; A. J. Puukko, 'Jeremias Stellung zum Deut. 8,' *BWAT* 13 (1913), 126 ff.; G. A. Smith, *Jeremiah*⁴ (1929), ch. 4; Causse, *Du groupe ethnique*, 177 ff.

maintaining the full effect of Josiah's reformation, assigns similar late origin to Jer. 1-10.⁶ But such extreme criticism of Jer. may be avoided by assuming a sharp cleavage between idealistic prophet and politically minded king.

§4. THE POLITICS OF JOSIAH'S REIGN

The interest of Biblical scholarship has naturally centred on the religious reformation, for which indeed we have data only for Judah. Josiah's confronting of Necho at Megiddo presents another phase of his reign, and that a secular one; he attempted full recovery of the ancient bounds of All-Israel, and this as part of his duty as YHWH's Anointed.⁷ For the political expansion of Josiah's kingdom with inclusion of the Israelite North Alt has proposed the interesting theory that the remains of the list of Josiah's territorial districting of the whole country are found in Josh. 18²¹⁻²⁸, 19^{2-8, 41-46}.⁸ There must have been some such political reorganization of his enlarged dominion to explain Josiah's defiance of Necho upon his intrusion into the strategic Jezreel Valley, and such secular causes may well have superseded those of religion. But there was the tragic collapse, which a Jeremiah may have feared, if not foreseen. The great prophets in general avoided 'entangling alliances' (cf. 20^{12ff.}), and demanded faith in the arm of the Lord alone. It was as in the age of the Protestant Reformation, when monarchs and reformers by no means saw alike; the two groups worked together only when idealism and realism harmonized, though most often with a muddling of causes.

The last quarter of the seventh century was crucial in the world's history. The proud Assyrian empire fell into the dust. The nations of Egypt and Babylonia were revived with the hope of restoration of ancient empire. New kingdoms were established on the frontiers, Media and Lydia, and alien hordes of barbarous peoples, Kimmerians,

⁶ See his *Pseudo-Ezekiel* (1930), ch. 3 (cf. review by S. Spiegel in *HTR* 24 [1931], 245 ff.), and 'The Background of Jer. 1-10,' *JBL* 56 (1937), 193 ff.

⁷ Cf. the pertinent article by Olmstead, 'The Reform of Josiah and its Secular Aspects,' *AHR* 20 (1915), 566 ff.

⁸ 'Judas Gaue unter Josia,' *Pjb.*, 21 (1925), 100 ff., and 'Eine galliläische Ortsliste in Jos. 19,' *ZAW* 1927, 59 ff.; cf. Procksch, pp. 26 ff., and Noth, *Das Buch Josua*, *HAT* (1938), pp. ix ff., and Albright's review with archaeological criticism in *JBL* 57 (1938), 226. A similar military reorganization of the kingdom has been proposed by E. Junge, 'Der Wiederaufbau des Heerwesens des Reiches Juda unter Josia,' *BWANT*, Folge IV, Heft 23 (1937). Vincent, in *La religion des judéo-araméens d'Éléphantiné*, 8 ff., 359 ff., holds that these early 'Jewish' colonists were refugees from Josiah's purge of the North and from the Scythian invasion. The Jewish military colonies in Egypt may indeed go back to auxiliaries sent by Manasseh in his rebellion against Assyria, a practice condemned by Dt. 17¹⁶.

and Scythians, fanned an apocalyptic fervour. To Josiah's eye the God-given day had come with the destruction of Assyria, and so the divine opportunity for the political as well as the religious restoration of Israel. In modern terms, while religiously sincere, Josiah as king was a nationalist, a veritable King Arthur. He failed tragically in this rôle. Only 'the Book found,' which was published under his patronage, and the People of the Book survived.

VV.³¹⁻³⁵. Judah a province of Egypt; the brief reign of Jehoahaz, and the Pharaoh's installation of his brother Eliakim-Jehoiakim as king. || 2 Ch. 36¹⁻⁴, I Esd. 1³²⁻³⁶ (34-38); *cf. Ant.*, x, 5, 2. For the international history from this point to the end of the book see the continuations of the Histories listed in Additional Note above, §I. Between the events of the above section and those of the following chapters occurred, in 605 B.C., the momentous defeat of Necho at Karkemish, modern Jerablus, on the Euphrates at the NE point of Syria, by Nebuchadnezzar, the Babylonian crown-prince, who pursued the Egyptians to their frontiers, and then returned home to take the crown in succession to his father Nabopolassar. For the battle, with exact dating ('in Jehoiakim's fourth year') and prophetic amplification, *cf. Jer.* 46. In this connexion is to be consulted the long extract from Berossos in *Ant.*, x, II, 1, our prime authority for this western extension of Nebuchadnezzar's empire. For the subsequent history details are obscure. An anecdote from the beginning of Jehoiakim's reign reports his influence with the Egyptian government (*Jer.* 26^{20ff.}). He may have professed submission to the conqueror of Syro-Palestine (*cf.* 24⁷), but at heart have remained friendly to Egypt. The datum of 24¹ speaks of an undated advance by Nebuchadnezzar upon Jerusalem, Jehoiakim then becoming 'his servant' for three years, and later 'rebelling.' See Kittel, *GVI* 2, 421, n. 1, for discussion of the chronology involved.

31. *Twenty-three years old was Jehoahaz when he began to reign, and for three months did he reign in Jerusalem. And his mother's name was Hamutal, daughter of Jeremiah of Libnah.*

32. *And he did what was evil in the eyes of YHWH, like all that his fathers had done. 33. And Pharaoh-Necho made him a prisoner at Riblah in the land of Hamath, 'so that he might not reign in Jerusalem' [secondary, Kr. correcting Kt.; see Note]. And he put on the land a tribute of a hundred talents*

of silver and a [numeral evidently missing] talent of gold. **34.** And Pharaoh-Necho made Eliakim ben Josiah king in his father Josiah's stead (*i.e.*, with legal ignoring of the predecessor), and he changed his name to Jehoiakim. And Jehoahaz he took, and he (Jehoahaz) came to Egypt, and he died there. **35.** And the silver and the gold Jehoiakim gave to Pharaoh; he just taxed the land to give the money [Heb. silver] according to Pharaoh's command; of every one according to his rating did he exact the silver and the gold—'the people of the land' [interpretative gloss]—to give it to Pharaoh-Necho. **31.** The new king evidently adopted a throne-name in place of the earlier 'Shallum,' by which he is known in Jeremiah's dirge (22^{10a}), and in the royal genealogy in 1 Ch. 3¹⁵, according to which he was Josiah's fourth son, Jehoiakim being the second son; in this case the selection of the younger prince would suggest a popular choice for some reason. But see Albright's argument (*JBL* 51 [1932], 92) that the figure would make Josiah only 14 years of age at Jehoiakim's birth (*cf.* however Comm., 22¹), and accordingly the figure is in error, and this prince was a younger brother. It may well be, with Albright, and Curtis, *ad loc.*, that the family tree in 1 Ch. 3¹⁵ is wholly unreliable. For the change of name, Shallum to Jehoahaz, there is to be noticed the extensive use of names with *yāhū* as component in this period, for which see Torczyner, *LL* 27 ff. The queen-mother's origin from rebellious Libnah (*cf.* 19⁸) is of interest, and suggests a diplomatic marriage; her name is of Arabic origin (see Note). **33.** For the importance of Riblah as capital of Cœle-Syria at the time, *cf.* 25^{6f.} 20^{f.}. The place, with the name surviving, lies 34 km. S of Homs in the Orontes valley; see Robinson, *LBR* 544 ff. (with full description of the now swampy terrain), Dussaud, *TH* 396 ff., Abel, *GP* 2, 436. A talent of gold: ⊕ made the extravagant guess of '100 talents,' but ⊕^u more reasonably '10 talents,' which is the proportion noted for the two metals in the tribute to Sennacherib, 18¹⁴, '300 of silver, and 30 of gold.' The figure in both cases is far below the 1000 talents stated to have been levied on Menahem of Israel (15¹⁹). **34.** The change of name meant that the prince was created a new person by the Pharaoh. Similarly Nebuchadnezzar changed the subsequent king's name Mattaniah to Sedekiah (24¹⁷). Šanda cites such cases

in Egypt; e.g., Necho of Saïs gave his son Psammetichos I an Assyrian name, Nabū-šēzib-anni (*cf.* Rogers, *HBA* 2, 433). This ancient legality has survived in the Church, where historically a new name has been required at baptism, and so upon graduation to the priesthood, or to the papacy. This change of name suggested to Stade (*GVI* 1, 674) that it represented an understanding between the Deuteronomic reformers and Egypt, but this was absurd; Robinson remarks, far more to the point (*HI* 1, 431), that the change of name was 'perhaps a concession to Israelite feeling'; or rather there may have been a touch of satire on the Pharaoh's part, as though YHWH were actually on Egypt's side, *cf.* the Rab-shakeh's taunt, 18²⁵. For the death of Shallum in a strange land see Jeremiah's dirge, cited above. **35.** The v. presents universal taxation of the whole land, in contrast to the levy under Menahem, when only the men of wealth were assessed. The phrase, *the people of the land*, lacks construction (*n.b.* rewriting in EVV), but is a correct additional note. Critics (Klostermann, Stade, *al.*) have variously attempted improvement of the text. It would appear from Jeremiah's 'Woe' against Jehoiakim (22^{13ff.}) that the king profited selfishly from this conscription of the wealth of all citizens—a common feature in Oriental handlings of money.

31. יהואחז = 13¹; at 14¹ יהואחז.—הטוטל: many MSS הטיטל = Kt. 24¹⁸, Jer. 52¹ (either vocalization possible); Grr., Jos., in the three cases = the latter form; *cf.* אביטל, 2 Sam. 3⁴, 1 Ch. 3³. For the first element, 'father-in-law,' *cf.* the name in 1 Ch. 4²⁶, to be read הטיטאל, and S. Arab. הטאל, and like combinations (*NPS* 1, 229). For the second element *cf.* יהוטל in Eleph. papp.; it means 'shade/shadow,' and appears in the repeated phrase of the Aram. copy of the Behistun inscription from the same quarter, בטלה די אהורזור. Equivalent Heb. names are עלקטר (with change of Kṛ.), קעלאל (*cf.* Ps. 17⁸, etc.). The present name with ט for Heb. צ is doubtless Arabic. Noth (*IP* 39, 79) objects to this derivation, ignoring the S. Arab. names, and taking טל as 'dew' (!).—ירטיוה: on a seal and in a Lachish letter (*IAE* 215, Torczyner, *LL* no. 1), the full form in -yāhū is universal in these letters.—**33.** ויסירוהו טלך מצרים, Ch., ויאסרוהו פ' נ' ברבלה בארץ חמת בטלך בירושלם; בירושלם here, "and he removed him . . . from reigning" = ט^H, and the same influence induced the Kṛ. here, טמלך = ט^H מ^H; but the clumsy phrase בטלך ב' was an early accommodation with Ch., which ignores the item of the deposition at Riblah. Burn. unnecessarily finds

a reduction of two statements, "bound him at Riblah," and "removed him from reigning in Jerusalem."—עָנַשׁ עַל הָאֵינֶן : 𐤂 om. through mistranslation of prec. יָתַן with ἐδωκεν (= 𐤂).—[וְהָבָה] : כִּכָּר [= N al.; 𐤂 (B A al.), 𐤂 '100 talents'; 𐤂^L 𐤂^A 'ten talents'; 𐤂^H dubiously, 'talents.'—34. אֵילִיקִים : see Note, 18¹⁸.—יְהוֹיָקִים : cf. יוֹיָקִים, Neh. 12¹⁰, and so on a seal, IAE 197 ; יוֹיָקִים, on a seal, Cooke, NSI 362.—וְיָבֵא=𐤂 𐤂^A ; other VSS as transitive=וְיָבֵא ; 𐤂^L as though וְיָבֵאוּ=Ch. ; 𐤂 is to be retained.—35. אֵת עַם הָאָרֶץ : Grr. tr. the prep. with μετα=𐤂^H ; 𐤂 𐤂^A with 'from' ; 𐤂 om. the phrase.

23³⁶–24⁷. The reign of Jehoiakim. || 2 Ch. 36⁵⁻⁸ (where 𐤂, supplying lacuna of a parallel to Ki., vv.^{1b-4}, has a text parallel to, but differing from, 𐤂 of Ki.), 1 Esd. 1³⁷⁻⁴⁰ (39-42) ; cf. *Ant.*, x, 5, 2, 6. The historical data are few : the introductory formula to the reign, 23³⁶, the relations with Babylon, 24^{1-2, 7}, the king's death and the succession, v.⁶. Ch. 24. **1.** *In his days Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon came up, and Jehoiakim became his vassal for three years ; then he turned and rebelled against him.* **2a.** *And YHWH sent against him the (guerilla) bands of Chaldæa and the bands of Aram and the bands of Moab and the bands of the Buê-Ammon.* For these roving bands, always characteristic of those frontiers in unsettled times (cf. 5²), of Chaldæans (the first appearance of the word in the historical books) and Aramæan auxiliaries, cf. Jer. 35¹¹, where it is reported that the rustic Rechabites had to take refuge in Jerusalem from the depredations of invading troops, 'Chaldæans and Aramæans.' Nebuchadnezzar was otherwise occupied than to take a formal campaign, but he was now relieved of the Egyptian aggression (v.⁷). 𐤂 om. 'YHWH,' and it is secondary (so Stade, Eissfeldt, cf. BH), glossed in from the following moralizing section ; but Nebuchadnezzar continues as subject of the foll verb. **2b.** *And he sent them into Judah 'to work destruction' [= 𐤂 Hex. ; 𐤂 to destroy him] according to the word of YHWH that he spoke through his ministers the prophets.* **3.** *Just according to the utterance [Heb. mouth] of YHWH was it in the case of Judah for removal from his face for the sin of Manasseh, according to all that he did ;* **4.** *'and also the innocent blood that he shed, and he filled Jerusalem with innocent blood' (the repetitive, unconstructable passage secondary) and YHWH was unwilling to forgive.* The adverb *just* (EVV only), as common in Semitic

syntax, relates to the climax of the period; in this case it was just Manasseh's sin that entailed the inevitable calamity, as foreordained (21^{10ff.}, 23^{26, 27}). The long bracketed section is an intrusion suggested by 21¹⁶ for a more specific indictment. 5. 6. In this postscript there is no reference to the king's burial. But Ⓞ in Ch., v.⁸ (where Ⓡ ignores the death), adds: "he was buried in the garden of Uzza" (cf. 21²⁶), which Ⓞ^L repeats here with plus, 'with his fathers.' It is attractive to regard this Gr. supplement as original, which would then have been elided to avoid clash with the Jeremianic prophecies of the king's being 'buried with an ass's burial,' 'cast forth beyond the gates of Jerusalem' (Jer. 22¹⁹; cf. 36²⁰), on which matter Josephus expatiates; accordingly many critics restore the item to the text (so Stade, *GVI* 1, 679, n. 1, and *SBOT*, Wellhausen, *Comp.*, 359, Benzinger, Šanda, Eissfeldt). But Lucian's testimony is generally dubious, and Ⓞ of Ch. is certainly secondary, for according to Ch. v.⁶ Jehoiakim was taken prisoner to Babylon. If the king died in the siege by the roving bands, he could not have been accorded proper burial outside of the city's wall; hence the editor's ignorance is explainable. 7. *And the king of Egypt came again no more out of his land; for the king of Babylon had taken, from the Wady of Egypt to the river Euphrates, all that belonged to the king of Egypt.* For historical order this detached item belongs to the beginning of the section. For an asserted capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar in Jehoiakim's third year, with the latter's captivity in Babylon and the despoliation of the temple (Ch. v.⁶, Dan. 1^{1ff.}), see the writer's Comm. on Daniel at length. A study of the contemporary history has been given by G. R. Tabouis, *Nebuchadnezzar* (1931).

Ch. 23. 36. וְנִידָה: MSS, Ⓚr., וְנִידָה: the variant vowels represent Heb. and Aram. forms; the Gr. have amazing variations; other VSS=Kt., exc. Ⓞ, also Jos.=Ⓚr. For the name see Note, I. 4⁵.—פְּרִיָהּ=פְּרִיָהּ, 1 Ch. 27²⁰, and on a seal, *IAE* 203. Gr. again vary; *n.b.* Φαδαλ/εηλ in Hex. MSS. Ⓞ^L demanded that the mother of the other two brothers (23³¹, 24¹⁸) be mother of this prince, and altered the statement accordingly (see Rahlfs, *SS* 3, 279 f.—רוּמָה: possibly Khan Rumeh, N of Sepphoris in Galilee, known to Jos. and Talmud (Abel, *GP* 2, 438) and=Aruma, mentioned along with Marum=Mezom in Tiglath-pileser's Annals 18*

(line 234, Rogers, *CP* 319). But *n.b.* דומה, var. רומה, in Judah, Josh. 15⁶².

Ch. 24. **1.** נבוכדנאצר: for the various spellings here see Ken., and for the correct form, נבוכדראצר, in Jer. alone, the Lexx.—**2.** כשרים: without article, and so at 25⁶, otherwise at 25²⁶; *cf.* similar use of פלשתים.—ארה: א as 'Edom,' preferred by Grätz, Klost., Burn.—עמון: ע^L+ 'and from Samaria.'—Hex. = להאביר, preferable, with the absolute use of the verb; *cf.* cases vv. 3, 4, להבעים 21⁶.—**3.** אך: the interpretation given above, following Ehrl., preserves the text, which has troubled critics; see Kit.—[על] פי: = פ; other VSS as אף (א^L א with indirect translation), and so = v. 20; St. allows the possibility of א, which indeed is fully supported by the argument of the period.—היה: for the impersonal verb in the fem. see GK §144, b, c, as used of natural phenomena; the same usage at large in Aram., see Nöld., *Syr. Gram.*, §254, also in Arab., *e.g.*, jābat, 'it was fine (weather)'; *cf.* also Note 19²⁶.

24⁸⁻¹⁷. The reign of Jehoiachin. || 2 Ch. 36⁹⁻¹⁰, Jer. 29², 1 Esd. 1⁴¹⁻⁴⁴ (43-46); *cf.* *Ant.*, x, 6, 3; 7, 1.

8. Eighteen years old was Jehoiachin when he began to reign, and three months did he reign in Jerusalem. And his mother's name was Nehushta bath Elnathan of Jerusalem. **9.** And he did what was evil in YHWH's eyes, like all that his father did. **10.** At that time came up the officers [EVV servants] of Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon to Jerusalem, and the city entered into siege. **11.** And Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon came against the city while his officers were besieging it; **12.** and Jehoiachin king of Judah went out to the king of Babylon, he and his mother and his ministers [EVV servants] and captains and chamberlains [Heb. primarily eunuchs]. And the king of Babylon took him (prisoner) in the eighth year of his reign.

13. And he brought out thence all the treasures of the house of YHWH and the treasures of the king's house; and he cut up all the gold vessels which Solomon king of Israel had made, in the hall of YHWH, even as YHWH had said.

15. And he deported Jehoiachin to Babylon; and the

king's mother and the king's wives and his chamberlains and the nobles of the land he took off, a deportation from Jerusalem to Babylon.

14. *And he deported all Jerusalem and all the captains*

16. *and all the soldiers, 7000, and the artisans and the smiths, 1000 the whole number, trained soldiers, fighting men; and the king of Babylon brought them, a deportation, to Babylon.* *and all the trained men of the army, 10,000—a deportation—and all the artisans and smiths; there was none left except the humblest of the people of the land.*

17. *And the king of Babylon made his uncle Mattaniah king in his stead; and he (i.e., the k. of B.) changed his name to Sedekiah.*

V.⁸. The royal name has the Biblical variants 'Jeconiah,' 'Coniah'; it appears as 'Yochin' on a local stamp of a royal 'page' of the king, and now, most recently, as 'Yaukina king of Judah' in a Babylonian inscription; see Note. VV.¹⁰⁻¹¹. The siege was climaxed by the advent of Nebuchadnezzar for the surrender. V.¹². The surrender (they *went out*) of the king and royal personnel is well illustrated by the Assyrian picture of the surrender of Lachish (see Comm. on 18¹⁴). The queen mother is included in Jeremiah's dirge (22^{24ff.}), and is pathetically referred to in 13¹⁸, while 29² is a repetition, with variation, of the present v. The v. concludes with the first dating according to an extra-Israelite imperial system, in the year of the conqueror, 'the 8th of his reign.' In Jer. 52²⁸ this deportation is dated 'in the 7th year'; the present dating follows the Jewish system of reckoning, that in Jer. the Babylonian, which regarded the fractional initial year as the *res šarrūti*, 'beginning of the reign,' a case of which is presented in 25²⁷ (but see Note *ad loc.* for further discussion).

VV.¹³⁻¹⁷. The most extensive criticism of this passage, following Thénius, Ewald (*HI* 4, 204), is that by Stade in *ZAW* 4 (1884), 271 ff. (with study of the deportation figures

for the several captivities) ; *cf.* Begrich's summary agreement, *Chronologie*, 197. The critical display of the text given above may speak for itself. VV.^{15.17} are the straightforward sequence of vv.⁸⁻¹² ; it is the king and his court who are deported, the little state of Judah is left with an imperial appointee of the blood royal as king. V.¹⁵ is repetitive with a brief list of the officials, plus *the wives* (!) of the young king. The substance of these vv. appears to be of archival origin with their interest confined to the court. V.¹⁶, out of place where it stands, supplies definite information on the other deported classes, the military, and the artisan guilds, with at least modest figures. However a much smaller figure is given for this deportation in Jer. 52^{28π}, namely 3023, while of the figures there listed for the three captivities the sum total is only 4600. The latter figure doubtless refers only to men, so that a much higher figure is to be assumed for the total of souls ; *cf.* the figure of 27,290 captives taken by Sargon from Samaria. The two remaining vv. are definitely secondary. V.¹³ is out of place ('brought out thence,' with distant antecedent), and the account of the looting of all the treasures of temple and palace and of all Solomon's gold vessels in the temple-hall, 'according to the divine word,' is an expansive summary. It possesses no doubt a basis of real fact, and Torrey well makes the point (*Pseudo-Ezekiel*, 104) that according to this statement the conqueror converted 'into bullion' the gold vessels, which therefore were not preserved intact as according to the tradition in 2 Ch. 36^{7.10.18}, Dan. 1². Below (25¹⁵) only minor gold and silver vessels are named in the final looting. V.¹⁴ with its initial statement of the deportation of 'all Jerusalem' (the adjective critically omitted by Ⓞ) is extravagant, and the rest of the v. is a duplicate of v.¹⁶ with a large round number for the military deportees, and a conclusion for the remnant in the land that duplicates 25¹². Withal these additions have their contemporary interest. The military are variously referred to, with difficulty for English translation ; *the soldiers* (Ⓢ) *men of war* are paralleled with *the trained men of the army* (EVV *mighty men of valour*) ; for the latter see Comm. on 15²⁰, where they are the upper class of landed estate, who like the knights of later Europe led forth their clans to war. The repetition in v.¹⁶ of *trained*

soldiers (ח *gibbôrîm*), fighting men (Heb. *makers of war*—*cf.* the EVV for these terms) is quite supernumerary. A matter of sociological interest appears in the words translated *artisans* and *smiths* (the latter word of uncertain denotation); the nouns are in the collective singular, denoting guilds; see Causse, *Du groupe ethnique*, 40 ff., and the archæologically based articles by I. Mendelsohn (see under Bibliography, xxvii). The parallel in Ch. and ע disputes the designation of Mattaniah as Jehoiachin's uncle; see Note. For the change of name *cf.* the case of Jehoiakim, 23³⁴.

8. '18 years': Ch., '8'; but *n.b.* the 'wives,' *inf.*—יהויכין; *n.b.* the variations: יכניה, Jer. 24¹, 28⁴, 29², 1 Ch. 3^{16.17}, and כניהו, Jer. 22^{24.28}. The royal name appears in three contemporary identical jar-handle stamps, two from Tell Beit-Mirsim, one from Beth-Shemesh, with the text, אליקים נער יוכן, 'Eliakim steward¹ of Yochin'; see Albr., 'The Seal of Eliakim,' etc., *JBL* 51 (1932), 77 ff., and Diringer, *IAE* 126. Professor Albright also favoured the writer with copy of a communication he received from E. F. Weidner, reporting an Akk. inscription found in the royal palace in Babylon, later published by him in the *Mélanges Dussaud*, vol. 2. It details the payment of corn and oil to an encyclopædic list of persons, including 'Yaukinu šarru ša Yaḥudu.' *Cf.* the royal treatment subsequently given to the king acc. to 25^{27ff.2}. In the form given here the name means 'Y. establishes'; *cf.* the name 'Yachin,' I. 7²¹. The verb in the other two forms must be ק al, *i.e.*, 'Y. exists,' with the mng. of the verb as in Phœn., Akk., Arab. Noth assumes (*IP* 202, n. 1) the root כנן, 'to protect,' without good reason. Albr. proposes (*JBL* n. 13) as basis 'Yekenyahu,' with verb in Hif., 'Let Y. establish,' but without explanation of the verbal stem in the Biblical tradition, which is safer basis for etymology. There may well have been play upon the two verbal stems. Apart from a limited group of Gr. MSS (*e.g.*, g h n x y, but not consistently) the Grr., also ע , and Esd. v.⁴³, by confusion with the preceding royal name, present the process $\text{I}\omega\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu > \text{I}\omega\kappa\epsilon\iota\mu$, a confusion

¹ So Albr., with extensive treatment of the word, as also in *SAC* 153; the word has generally been translated above with 'page,' or 'squire,' *e.g.*, I. 20¹⁴.

² P.S.—Dr. Albright's information was published by him in an extensive article, 'King Joiachin in Exile,' *BA* 1942, 49 ff., to which the reader is referred for a summary review of a most interesting lot of nearly 300 cuneiform tablets, stating the rations to captives and artisans from many peoples. Five sons of the king are named; *cf.* the seven assigned to him in 1 Ch. 3^{17f.}.

persisting in the Christian tradition; *cf.* Mt. 1¹¹, and see Rahlfs, SS 3, 115, 122, 123.—‘3 months’: Ch.+‘and 10 days.’—אלנתן: the name in the contemporary Lachish letter, no. 3.—10. עלה עברי: Kr. of the verb עלה (and so 12 MSS), as demanded; MSS Ken. 70, 176, deR. 539 om. the noun, and so all VSS exc. ט ז; St., Eissf. prefer the elision; but the v. notes the investment of the city, v.¹¹ the advent of Neb. for the surrender.—11. על העיר: על ‘into the city.’—על reverses the two statements in the v.; see St., and Rahlfs, *ib.*, 210.—12. על [מלך]: 13 MSS Ken., deR., א, which is demanded, and so על with *pros.*—אתו: Gr. MSS with pl. pron., *ad sensum.*—14. והנלה: again the irregular consecution.—[הרדיתם]: כל of Grr. only Hex. has (שׁ^H ✕).—עשרה: Kr. עשרת = MSS.—נולה: על for the phrase, *αἰχμαλωτισίαν* (rdg. the sing. with MS j) *δεκα χιλιάδες αἰχμαλωτισίας* (*cf.* שׁ^H), *i.e.*, with double interpretation of the word as noun and ppl.; על has the noun = נולה, which is to be read. Joüon (*Mél.*, 5, 485) supports Kr., endeavouring to discriminate between the masc. and fem. of the ppl.—הנזכר: the unique noun only in the repetitions, v.¹⁸, Jer. 24¹, 29²; all VSS (exc. שׁ א, which go their own way) as from the root ‘ס, ‘to shut up’: Grr., ‘one who locks up,’ and so ט ז, ‘clusor,’ Kimchi, ‘locksmith’ (Jastrow, *Dict.*, *s.v.*); but such mngs. would stand for very petty guilds. EVV simplify with ‘smiths’ = GV FV, and so obtain good sense. The Arab. root *sajara*, ‘to roast in an oven,’ is to be accepted for the mng., as of metal-smiths, in parallelism with the preceding guild of artisans, carpenters, and the like. This etymology may well explain the term והב סנור I. 6²⁰, which is there translated with ‘refined gold,’ *i.e.*, gold well smelted. The Arab. root has the primary mng. of ‘to flow,’ and this mng. appears for the same root in Heb. at Prov. 27¹⁵, ביום סנייר, ‘in a day of downpour.’ For further discussion see Then., the Commentaries of Graf and Giesebrecht on Jer. 24¹; Then. and Graf accept Hitzig’s ingenious suggestion, understanding נר קם, and as parallel to טס עובר, I. 9²¹; but this is not to the point here.—דלת עם הארץ: the phrase as ד’ הארץ only at 25¹² and parallel in Jer.—15. אולי [הארץ]: Kr. אולי (=many MSS), and so the Kt. in the same phrase at Eze. 17¹³; for the word see Lexx., roots אול, איל, and for a possible use of the word in the present sense in Phoen. see Harris, *Gram.*, 77.—16. הכל: ‘the sum total,’ as at Ps. 14³ = קלו Ps. 53⁴.—17. מתניהו: מתניהו appears in Lachish letter no. 1; J. A. Thomson *cf.* Bab. ‘Mattaniama,’ *AASOR* 86 (1943), 24 f.—דודו: for the various denotations of the noun see Lexx.; Jer. 25¹ makes the king definitely uncle of Jehoiachin; Eze. 17¹³ refers to him indefinitely as ‘one of the seed royal’; MS 70 om. (because of the dispute?); Ch., ‘his brother,’ but על there, ‘his father’s brother,’ and so in the royal genealogy, 1 Ch. 3¹⁶. על here (B A *al.*) = בנו, and so deR. 701; Šanda suggests that *υιου* is corruption of *θειου*; 1 Esd. om. See further Comm., 23³¹.

Ch. 24¹⁸-ch. 25. The last days of the nation. Cf. *Ant.*, x, 7, 2 ff. In addition to a moralizing summary in Ch. 36¹¹⁻²¹= 1 Esd. 1^{43ff.} (45ff.), this section is paralleled by two sections of Jeremiah. Jer. 52 is a duplicate, with often better text, omitting the Judæan revolt (Ki. 25²²⁻²⁶—for which see below). The text of 25¹⁻¹² is the original of the evident insertion in Jer. 39, vv. 1-10. On the other hand Jer. 40⁷⁻⁴¹ is the basis of the brief summary contained here in vv. 22-26. The book, as also Jer. (52²⁷), originally concluded with the sombre statement (v. 21^b), *And Judah went into exile from off its land*. To this were added postscripts (cf. the unique postscript in Jer. 52²⁸⁻³⁰, with dates and census of the figures for the three captivities): (1) vv. 22-26, the anecdote of Gedaliah's flight; (2) vv. 27-30, the imperial benevolence to Jehoiachin, dated 37 years after his captivity, i.e., ca. 560 B.C., and so terminus for the dating of the book. As a supplementary, but annalistically true statement, it gives an auspicious conclusion for the future with the note of the 'lifting up of the head' of the exiled king. Cf. Ch. with its postscript, taken from Ezra 1, giving Cyrus's proclamation of release.¹

The primary editor, to his terminus at 25²¹, knows only his people's sad history. He records nought of the international complications in which Sedekiah was involved, and of which the book of Jeremiah gives exposition.² The Pharaoh-Necho

¹ For the problem of the parallel narratives in Jer. see Commentaries on that book (in particular Cornill's) and Introductions. The text of Ki. has been much mutilated, as the VSS prove. For the inner-Hebrew variations see Sperber, *Hebrew . . . in Parallel Transmission*. The duplicates in Jer., for both Heb. and Gr., are presented fully in Vanu-telli's volume, and the parallelisms in English by Kent, *SBOT*. For the Gr. text of the parallels in Jer. and its secondary origin see Olmstead, 'Source Study and the Biblical Text,' 1 ff. For an essay at precise dating see Albright's presentation cited in the Bibliography in *Int.*, § 16, and for the light thrown by the Lachish letters upon these last days of Judah, Gordon, *The Living Past*, ch. 9.

² For the contemporary history involved in the rise of the Neo-Babylonian empire see Breasted, *HE* ch. 28; Alt, *Israel u. Aegypten*, 10 ff.; Hall, *AHNE* ch. 12; Thompson, *CAH* 3, ch. 10; Kittel, *GVI* 2, §50; Olmstead, *HPS* ch. 35; Meyer, *GA* 3, 170 ff.; Robinson, *HI* 1, 435 ff. For the citations in Josephus (*Ant.*, x, 11, 1) and Eusebius from Berossos, Abydenos, Polyhistor, see Schnabel, *Berossos*, 273 ff.

of ch. 23 died in 594 B.C., and was succeeded by his son Psammetichos II, and he by Apries of the Greek tradition, the Hophra of Jer. 44³⁰ (588-569 B.C.). The last-named king took aggressive action against Babylon with an attack upon Philistia by sea. In opposition Nebuchadnezzar, probably fearing a direct attack upon the Syrian coast, and following Necho's example (23³³), established his military centre at Riblah (vv. 6. 20f.), and this notice has its correspondent in his inscription in the Wady Brisa in the Lebanon (Rogers, *CP* 365, Gressmann, *ATB* I, 365). As Jeremiah shows, Sedekiah wavered in his allegiance, but finally declared for the pro-Egyptian party, and this brought upon him and his *entourage*, sacred and civil, the vengeance of his overlord. Our chronicler notes the exact dates of investment and capture of the city in Babylonian terms (vv. 1-3), the siege lasting from the royal 9th year, 10th month, 10th day, to the 11th year, 4th month, 9th day, *i.e.*, from *ca.* January, 587 B.C., to *ca.* July, 586; *cf.* the further exact dating in v. 8. The siege was one of starvation; the stout city might well have defied storming, and hence the final destruction of its walls (v. 10). *Cf.* Titus's five months' siege of the city. The minute details of the history, dates, events, personalities, vouch for the contemporary character of this notable document.

24¹⁸-25⁷. The reign of Sedekiah. **18.** The usual introductory data. **19-20a.** The moral judgment, with reminiscence of v. 3. **20b.** the history begins with the opening of the final catastrophe: *And Sedekiah rebelled against the king of Babylon.* Ch. gives the blame to the perfidious king, whom "Nebuchadnezzar had sworn by God." Ch. 25. **1.** *And it came to pass, in the ninth year of his reign, in the tenth month, on the tenth of the month, Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon and all his army came against Jerusalem, and encamped against it, and built a siege-wall round about.* The naming of the Babylonian king as present in the investment of the city is incorrect, at the most a formal expression; *cf.* Jer. 38^{17ff.}, according to which surrender was to be made to 'the king of Babylon's princes,' and that king was actually at Riblah (v. 6). **2.** *And the city entered into siege, up to the eleventh year of king Sedekiah.*

Ki. = Jer. 52⁶Jer. 39²

3. (Jer. + *in the fourth month*) *On the ninth of the month, and the famine was sore in the city, there was no food for the people of the land; 4a. and the city was breached.*

In the fourth month, and on the ninth of the month the city was breached.

The consecution in Ki. is impossible; there has been intruded a reference to the historical famine; cf. Jer. 37²¹. The specification of *the fourth month* must be restored from the parallels; this datum fails here also in all VSS exc. S A. For the later anniversary 'fast of the fourth month' and that of 'the fifth month' and two other ritual observances of the kind see Zech. 8¹⁹; cf. Nowack, *Arch.*, 2, 270; *JE* 5, 347 ff. The dating is after Babylonian fashion, from Nisan. 4b. *And all the men of war* [verb lacking, supplied by 4 MSS, ancient and modern VSS, e.g., EVV *fled*] *by night by the gate between the double-walls* [Heb. a dual], *which was by the king's garden, while the Chaldæans were against the city round about; and he went out by the way of (i.e., to) the Arabah.* 5. *And the army of the Chaldæans pursued after the king and overtook him in the wastes of Jericho, all his army being scattered from him.* With this are to be compared the parallels in Jer. 39^{4. 5a}: *And it came to pass that when Sedekiah king of Judah and all the men of war saw them* [with extensive antecedent in v.³], *that they fled, and went out by night from the city by the way of the king's garden, by the gate between the double-walls, and he went out by the way of the Arabah. And the army of the Chaldæans pursued after them, and overtook Sedekiah in the wastes of Jericho.* Jer. 52⁷ presents only the flight of the men of war, but v.⁸ centres on the king: *The army of the Chaldæans pursued after the king, and overtook Sedekiah in the wastes of Jericho, all his army being scattered from him.* The non-syntactical 'all the men of war' in v.⁴ is an evident intrusion from Jer. 52⁷; the same intrusion has been made in Jer. 39. The original passage here was a reduction of the original longer form, and may once have simply read: *And he* [with antecedent understood] *went out by way of the Arabah. And the army of the Chaldæans overtook him, etc.* For location of the gate cf. Is. 22¹¹, "Ye made a basin between the double-walls";

the second wall was probably the circumvallation of the Siloam pool (see Smith, *Jerusalem* 1, 225 f.). The *king's garden* appears in Neh. 3¹⁵ as 'close by the wall of the pool of haš-šēlah,' i.e., Siloam. The king's flight from the SE point of the city, aiming for Jericho, was indeed 'through a desert,' as Josephus remarks. Cf. the alleged presage of this flight in Eze. 12¹⁷. For *the wastes of Jericho* cf. Josh. 4¹³, etc. **6.** *And they seized the king, and brought him to the king of Babylon to Riblah. And he [so parallels in Jer., and also below; \mathfrak{H} they] took process with him.* **7.** *And Sedekiah's sons he slew before his eyes, and Sedekiah's eyes he blinded. And he fettered him in double-brass, and brought him to Babylon.* The translation *took process*, the Heb., literally, *spoke judgment*, renders the Babylonian juristic phrase, *dēna dabābu*; cf. Jer. 12¹, where it is used of legal argument. Restoration in two cases of the sing. pronoun *he* is necessary, cf. v. 21; judicially the penalty was the sovereign's action. The act of blinding captives appears in Assyrian reliefs; such mutilation destroyed the royal potency. For the king's captivity cf. Jer. 34²⁷, with the note, "thy eyes shall behold the eyes of the king of Babylon," and Eze. 12¹³, according to which the king shall be brought to Babylon, "yet shall he not see it, although he shall die there."

VV.⁸⁻²¹. The end. The section is composite: vv.⁸⁻¹², the destruction of the city and the exile; vv.¹³⁻¹⁷, an inventory of the temple brass and vessels carried off to Babylon; vv.¹⁸⁻²¹, the extreme penalty visited on the leaders of the revolt, with repeated statement of the exile.

8. *And in the fifth month, on the seventh of the month—that is the nineteenth year of king Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon—came Nebuzaradan, provost-marshal, minister of the king of Babylon, to Jerusalem.* There is again a synchronism with Babylonian chronology, cf. 24¹². The date is ca. July of 586 B.C. For variation of traditions as to the day-date see Note. For the title of Nabū-zēr-iddina (so the Akk. name), EVV 'chief of the guard' (but at Gen. 37³⁶ \mathfrak{G} 'chief cook'), properly 'chief-executioner,' see the writer's note in Comm. on Daniel, 2¹⁴. **9.** *And he burnt the house of YHWH and the king's house and all the houses of Jerusalem [\mathfrak{H} + the superfluous and ungrammatical clause, and every magnate's house he burnt with fire].* **10.** *And the walls of Jerusalem round about*

['all' [secondary?] *the Chaldean army* [D + gloss, *the provost-marshal's*] *broke down.* 11. *And the rest of the people that were left in the city, and the deserters, who had deserted to the king of Babylon* [E + *and the rest of the multitude*], *Nebuzaradan the provost-marshal took into exile.* The several bracketed sections are superfluous; the last one has given rise to various interpretations; see Note. The comment on the *deserters* is of interest. 12. *And of the humble-folk of the land the provost-marshal left some for vinedressers and 'husbandmen' [?].* For these classes cf. 24¹⁴. The mng. of the final term has only been guessed at; see Note.

VV.¹³⁻¹⁷. An intruded antiquarian but historical note, presenting a summary of the valuable metal loot taken by the Babylonians. V.¹³. The large pieces of brass they *broke up and carried their brass to Babylon.* V.¹⁴. The small brazen vessels they *took away* intact. V.¹⁵. The vessels of gold and silver the chief officer *took charge of*; these must have been small articles left over from the earlier looting (24¹³). VV.^{16, 17} are an added recapitulation based on I. 7^{15ff.}; for criticism, with parallel in Jer. 52¹⁷⁻²³, see Notes.

VV.^{18-21a}. The death-penalty inflicted upon selected Judæan notables. 18. *And the provost-marshal took Seraiah the chief priest, and Sephaniah the priest of second rank, and the three threshold guardians; 19. and from the city he took one chamberlain, the one in command of the men of war; and five men of those who saw the king's face, who were found in the city; and the secretary of [so the genitive with Jer., and MSS and VSS here] the commander of the host, who mustered the people of the land; and sixty men of the people of the land, who were found in the city.* 20. *And Nebuzaradan the provost-marshal took them, and brought them to the king of Babylon to Riblah.* 21a. *And the king of Babylon smote them and slew them at Riblah in the land of Hamath.* The summary punishment included, most exceptionally, the sacred *personnel* of the temple; apparently the hierarchy had led in the national cause. The three orders of the higher priesthood are presented as in 23⁴, with the additional figure of *three* for the threshold-guardians, who, it may be assumed, were titularly in charge of the three temple gates (see Smith, *Jerusalem*, 2, 67, 257). The primate appears for the first time with the ancient title *kôhên hâ-rô's*

(also in Ch., Ezra), as over against *hak-kôhên hag-gādôl*, literally 'the great priest'; see Comm. on 12¹¹. For Seraiah's genealogy see Comm., 22⁴. The second class of the condemned consisted of officers of state. The word translated *chamberlain* (primarily *eunuch*) is now applied to a generalissimo; cf. the Assyrian military title *rab-sarîs* at 18¹⁷. Five courtiers are listed with a unique title, like the British 'privy councillors.' And an army adjutant appears in the person of a scribe/secretary, charged with military enrolment, a secretary of war in modern terms; the 'scribe' appears in the mustering of Barak's forces, Jud. 5¹⁴, for which see Moore, *ad loc.*, and cf. the translations in EVV. The third estate is that of *the people of the land*, the country gentry; see Comm. on 11¹⁷, and cf. Würthwein in his study there noted, p. 44; an exemplary number of these, *who were found in the city*, were included. The formality of the judgment, all according to law, appears in the transportation of the condemned to the royal assize at distant Riblah.

V.^{21b}. The conclusion of the original book. Cf. the similar statement of the exile of North Israel, 17^{23b}. Jer. 52²⁸⁻³⁰ adds a list of numbered exiles in Nebuchadnezzar's several deportations; cf. the higher figure given in 24¹⁴. The term 'exile' is indeed a formal one; the autonomy and so the existence of the nation were destroyed by the deportation of the upper classes. See Torrey, *Pseudo-Ezekiel*, ch. 6, for drastic criticism of the tradition of a total exile, although his criticism of the statements in Ki. should be much modified. Cf. S. Spiegel's rejoinder, 'Ezekiel or Pseudo-Ezekiel,' *HTR* 24 (1931), 245 ff. A very loose statement appears below, in v.²⁶, to the effect that *all the people, both small and great*, fled to Egypt, but this must be interpreted as referring particularly to the rebellious band congregated about all *the army captains*. Notable is the contention of the archaeologist Albright, as against Torrey, based on his study of the ruined Judæan sites of this period, that there was a 'complete devastation' during the exile; see his *APB* 171 f., and his article, 'Recent Discoveries in Bible Lands,' ch. 17. However devastation does not involve deportation of all the inhabitants, even as the figures for the exiles in Jer. 52 are small.

VV.²²⁻²⁶. The Judæan revolt; a postscript summary of

Jer. 40⁷-41. **22.** *And as for the people that were left in the land of Judah, whom Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon had left, he appointed a governor over them, Gedaliah ben Ahikam ben Shaphan. 23. And all the captains of the forces, they and 'their men' [with Jer. ; \mathfrak{H} the men], heard that the king of Babylon had appointed Gedaliah governor, and they came to Gedaliah to Mispah, even [\mathfrak{H} and] Ishmael ben Nethaniah and Johanan ben Kareah and Seraiah ben Tanhumeth the Netophathite and Jaazaniah ben ham-Maachathi, they and their men. 24. And Gedaliah took oath with them and their men, and said to them : Be not afraid of the officials [EVV servants] of the Chaldæans. Dwell in the land, and serve the king of Babylon, and so it will be well with you. 25. And it was in the seventh month, there came Ishmael ben Nethaniah ben Elishama, of the seed royal, and ten men with him, and they smote Gedaliah [\mathfrak{H} +and he died, not in Jer.] and the Judæans and Chaldæans that were with him at Mispah. 26. And all the people, both small and great, and the captains of the forces, rose up and came to Egypt, for they were afraid of the Chaldæans.*

The Babylonian king as a wise statesman arranged for the proper administration of his new fief-land, and diplomatically appointed a Judæan gentleman of high rank as his vizier, with seat at Mispah. But there remained a stiff-necked opposition to the new order of things, despite the fair promises given by their fellow-citizen, the new viceroy. It was the same spirit as that which animated the Maccabæan revolt and later the one against Rome. Gedaliah's father Ahikam had interfered in behalf of Jeremiah at the beginning of Jehoiakim's reign (Jer. 26²⁴), and had earlier served on Josiah's commission of inquiry concerning the Book of the Law (22¹²). The son was evidently a statesman of moderation, with the same attitude towards politics as Jeremiah's. Comparison with the present history may be made with conditions at the second destruction of the temple, when Josephus 'deserted' to the Roman cause, and was exposed to the danger of assassination at the hand of fanatics, e.g., his *Vita*, 48. Gedaliah was able to make a sworn settlement with some of the fugitive bands and their leaders that were still in defiance of the new régime. But he was attacked and murdered along with his *entourage* by a small party led by Ishmael,

the latter with very personal concern, being one of the royal family. This high-handed crime terrified the whole group, and *they came to Egypt*, a statement of Egyptian provenance, as the verb shows. For their subsequent history the Jeremianic biography is to be consulted. Archæology has cast unexpected light on two of the persons involved. The seal 'of Gedaliahu Over-the-House,' לְגַדְלִיָּהוּ עַל הַבַּיִת, doubtless the person named here, has been discovered at Lachish; see Starkey, *ILN* August, 1935, 241, S. H. Hooke, *QS* 1935, 195 ff., Diringer, *IAE* 257. Also the seal 'of Jaazaniahu servant of the king,' לְיָאֲזַנְיָהוּ עֶבֶד הַמֶּלֶךְ, was discovered by Badè in 1932 at Tell en-Nasbeh; see his article on the find in *ZAW* 1933, 150 ff., and his *Manual of Excavation in the Near East*, ch. 17, also Diringer, *ib.*, 181. The name also occurs on a seal published by Torrey in *AASOR* II-III (1922), 105. As the Notes show, several of the other names listed have contemporary illustration from seals, etc. For the identification of Mispah see Comm. on I. 15²².

VV.²⁷⁻³⁰. The release and honouring of Jehoiachin. **27.** *And it was in the thirty-seventh year of the captivity of Jehoiachin king of Judah, in the twelfth month, on the twenty-seventh day of the month, that Evil-Merodach king of Babylon, in the year of his becoming king, lifted up the head (i.e., the person) of Jehoiachin king of Judah out of prison.* **28.** *And he spoke kindly with him, and set his throne above the throne(s) of the kings who were with him in Babylon.* **29.** *And he (Jehoiachin) changed his prison garments, and he ate bread before him (Evil-Merodach) continually all the days of his life.* **30.** *And for his allowance, a continual allowance was given him on the part of the king, every day a portion, all the days of his life.*

For this liberal treatment of the captive king, now corroborated by a Babylonian text, see Note to 24⁸. The date is given by the editor in Babylonia in Babylonian terms; *in the year of his becoming king* apparently means the same as Akk. *ina rēš šarrūti*, generally interpreted as the initial portion of a year before the first full calendar year of the reign. A parallel appears in an Elephantine papyrus (Sachau, Pap. vi, Cowley, no. 6): ". . . in year 21 (i.e., of Xerxes), the beginning of the reign when king Artaxerxes sat on his throne," i.e., a double dating in throne-terms. But there is to be noted the

conflagration at the new moon of the 5th month.—נבווראין: the VSS bear early witness to the vocalization of \mathfrak{B} . The alleged appearance of the name in the Eleph. papp. is to be denied; see Cowley, no. 9.—רב טבחים: Aq., \mathfrak{S} \mathfrak{A} properly, 'chief of the lictors'; other Grr., *αρχιμαγειρος*, 'chief cook,' as at Gen. 37³⁶, etc.; Jos., *στρατηγος*. A seal found at Tell el-Kheleifeh, earlier read as עבר המלך, is read by Albright as טבח המ' (*BASOR* 71 [1938], 17).—עבר מלך נבל: Jer. 52, \mathfrak{B} , and so Grr., \mathfrak{S}^H here, but rdg. as though עֶבֶר; but there is no reason for correction.—יירושלם: Jer. 52, בירוושלם.—9. וואת כל בית גדול = Jer. 52, but rdg. הגדול; Grr. (= \mathfrak{S}^H), 'every house,' exc. \mathfrak{L} 'every great house'; Jer. 39 lacks the gloss.—10. B A omi. the v., exc. the final subject, רב טבחים.—רב ח'לכה = Jer. 39, 52; all VSS, exc. \mathfrak{T} \mathfrak{V} , as sing.— \mathfrak{L} om.; prob. a gloss to חומת above, in agreement with Jer. 52.—אשר רב טבחים: Grr., Jer. 39 om.; Jer. 52, אשר את ר' ט', and so many MSS here = \mathfrak{S}^H , other VSS, EVV, etc.; but אשר = N. Israelite \mathfrak{S} , see Note, 6¹¹.—11. על המלך נבל: Jer. 52, and so 5 MSS here, אל מלך ב', the original may have been אל המלך with 'Babylon' glossed in; Jer. simply, עליו, *i.e.*, which, corrected with St.—אליו, *i.e.*, to the officer, is the simplest correction, with St.—יתר ההבון: Grr., exc. \mathfrak{L} , *το λοιπον του σθηριγματος* = \mathfrak{S}^H , as from root אמן, and so = Jer. 52, but the noun treated not as 'artisan,' but as 'reliability,' as at Dt. 32²⁰; \mathfrak{L} here = העם.—12. יתר העם: \mathfrak{L} \mathfrak{T} \mathfrak{S} \mathfrak{A} = הא' עמ' טר', as at 24¹⁴.—יבבים = Jer. 52, and so here BH (L), Walton, Ginsb.; Mich., Ken., Bār the Kt. נביב; see extensive note in deR. on variants and edd. \mathfrak{L} Hex. transliterate with *γαβειν* (so N *al.*, cf. \mathfrak{S}^H —B by error *ταβειν*), which would represent יבבים; \mathfrak{L} *γεωργους* = \mathfrak{S} \mathfrak{A} \mathfrak{V} ; cf. translation and order in \mathfrak{T} , 'farmers and vinedressers.' Jer. 39 gives an early perversion, ויתן להם כרמים ויבבים. The word has not been explained.—13. בית [י]: but בבית, *inf.*, *i.e.*, double rdgs.—For the pillars of brass, the bases, the sea of brass, cf. the summary, I. 7⁴¹⁻⁴⁴, which includes also the ten lavers, כיריות; this has been suggested for correction of מוכנות, since acc. to 16¹⁷ the bases had disappeared; but the writer followed the original account.—14. היצרות, היעם, המצרות, המצרות: a combination of I. 7^{40.50}, continued in v.¹⁵ with המצרות, המצרות. המצרות here corrects הכיריות there. Jer. 52 adds five more items.—לקחו: Grr. (exc. \mathfrak{L} = \mathfrak{S}^H) as sing., under influence of לקח, v.¹⁵.—16. האחד [הים]: 3 MSS אחד = Jer. 52 $\mathfrak{K}\mathfrak{r}$, correctly, *i.e.*, 'the pillars two, the sea one (piece),' as in epigraphic accounts, and similarly in v.¹⁹, 'a chamberlain, one (person).' Jer. has a plus of 'the oxen twelve.'—שלש אמה: cf. Akk. *ša mēnūtu lā išū* (Šanda).—17. שלש אמה: the numeral to be corrected to חמש, with Jer. 52, cf. I. 7¹⁶; such nouns may have been written with numeral strokes, as in the papp., and hence easily miswritten or misread; for the noun read pl., אמות, with many MSS, $\mathfrak{K}\mathfrak{r}$, Jer. 52.—על השבבה: a gloss, parallel to על הכרתה, with reminiscence of I. 7¹⁸; it is basis of an expansion in Jer. 52.—

19. אשר הוא: Aramaism; Jer. 52, אשר היה=Grr., in both cases by necessary rendering.—חמשה: Jer. 52, שבעה; Hex. MSS, N *al.*, 𐤇^{H} om.—המנצח שר הצבא= 𐤇 , Gr. MS x; Jer. 52, 'כפר ש' הצ', and so 3 MSS here= $\text{𐤇} \text{𐤇}^{\text{H}} \text{𐤇}^{\text{H}}$; 𐤇^{L} gives a preceding doublet, *τ. Σαφα τ. ἀρχιστρατηγικῶν*; 𐤇 'Sopher principem exercitus'; St. regards 'שר הצ' as a gloss; however in our ignorance of ancient officialdom criticism is arbitrary. See Comm.—המנצח: the Hif. here and in Jer. 52 is unique. Albr. finds the noun as a military title in the Cyprian inscr. freshly interpreted by him in *BASOR* 83 (1941), 14 ff.—20. על אל: read אל with 12 MSS, Jer.—V.^b, רב טבחים, to v.²⁹, לפני כל, fails in 𐤇^{H} through loss of a page.—23. והאנשים: read והאנשיהם, as below, and with 1 MS, Grr., $\text{𐤇} \text{𐤇}$ and Jer. 40⁷.—המצפה: 4 MSS, Jer., והמצפה.—וישמעאל וג': the conjunction is resumptive; the name Ishmael occurs on two seals, *IAE* 203, 210.—נתניה: 2 MSS, Jer., נתניהו, and so on seals, *ib.* 191, 192.—יהותן: the name as יהותן on an Egyptian ostrakon, Aimé-Giron, *Textes araméens*, no. 1. תנחמת=*'consolation'*; *cf.* Note on 'Manasseh', 21¹. The masc. name appears in a Lachish stamp (Diringer, *PEQ* 1941, 38 ff., no. 5).—הנפת: *i.e.*, of Netophah near Bethlehem, *Ezr.* 2²², *Neh.* 7²⁶, earlier identified with Bait-naṭṭif, now by Alt and others with 'Ain en-Naṭūf, 5 miles S of Bethlehem; see Abel, *GP* 2, 399. Jer. prefixes עופי.—ובני עופי: in a Lachish letter (Torczyner, no. 1), as son of מבועל.—24. מעברי: 4 MSS, Jer., מקביר, and so here 𐤇 , but this requires foll. את. St. would read מפני, as at v.²⁶, *cf.* some VSS. 𐤇 has here *παροδον*, *i.e.*, *rdg.* as מעבר, for which *cf.* עבר פניו, *Eze.* 1⁹, etc.; see Joüon, *Biblica*, 17, 345 ff., on use of עבר.—25. אלישמע: on seals, *IAE* 216, 257.—עשה: B† om.—וינו: B *al.* as sing.—וימת: this interruption of the sequence of accusatives is to be omitted, with 𐤇 , Jer. 41² (Gr. 48²).—27. שבעה: 1 MS שבעה; Jer. 52, חמשה; Grr. there 'fourth'—so scribes vary!—אויל מרדך: Schnabel (*Berossos*, 274, note) notes the old Latin version of Jos. for the first element as 'Amil,' and so revises the text of Jos.—מבית כלא: absolute, 'from prison'; it is unnecessary to read 'his prison,' with Grr. (exc. 𐤇^{L}), and so BH. Jer. pref. ויוצא אתו=3 MSS here, Grr., $\text{𐤇} \text{𐤇}$, exegetically. For the technical phrase, 'to lift up the head,' *cf.* Gen. 40¹³.—28. מעל כבא: for the prep. Jer., ממעל ל', which is preferable. For the noun, VSS tr. as pl., but the construct phrase is treated as a composite noun; *cf.* בית הבמות, etc.—29. ושנא: Jer. correctly, ושנא; *n.b.* Aramaizing irregular construction, as also in foll. וואכל.—ואכל לחם וג': *i.e.*, he was his constant guest; *cf.* Ps. 41¹⁰, etc.—30. אודתו: an Akk. word; *cf.* *iarāhtu*, Delitzsch, *Ass. Hwb.*, 310, 'wahrscheinlich Getreideportion,' and so from root 'to swallow'; *cf.* Bezold, *BAG* 67, listing also *arhītu*, 'Monatsrate,' with a question-mark.—ער יום מותו: Jer. 52 pref. ער יום מותו, a pure doublet; but following Haupt and earlier critics cited by him, also Šanda, the phrase in Ki., concluding with 'his life' is a euphemistic substitute for the original *finale* in 'his death.'

INDEXES

I. SELECT VOCABULARY OF HEBREW WORDS AND PHRASES

- אבי, 378.
 אביו, 273.
 אבים, 273.
 אדר, 244; cf. הדר.
 אדרמלך, 479, 506.
 אדרמלך, 479, 506.
 אוב, 522; 'ob, 520.
 אוסיר, 215.
 אוריה, 463.
 אהו, 230.
 אחיה, 247.
 אט, 335.
 איזבל, 291.
 איכבוד, 291.
 איל, 159.
 איתן, 132.
 אליהרף, 113-15, 118.
 אליקים, 552.
 אלישטע, 569.
 אל סבית, 425.
 אמון, 522.
 אנכי, 98.
 אסוך, 370.
 אסף, 378.
 ארות, 132.
 ארון, 100.
 ארמון, 290.
 ארצא, 289.
 אשנא (Ušna), 462.
 אשר, 98, 258, 504, 512, 568.
 אשר על העיר, 413.
 אשרה, 280.
 את, 328.
 Achbor, 527.
 Adad-melek, 476.
 Adrammelek, 476, 498, 499.
 'āz, 204
 'alāh, 196.
 Anammelek, 476.
 Asherah, 233, 268, 275, 300, 411,
 469, 530.
 Ashima, 474-6.
 Ashmat, 475.
 ברא, 263.
 בין, 406.
 בית המזות, 569.
 בליעל, 334.
 במזות, 111.
 בראדך, 512.
 Baal, 308.
 Baal-zebul, 349.
 Baladan, 509, 512.
 Bathsheba, 84.
 Beelzebul, 349.
 Berodach-baladan, 509.
 Beth-El, 475, 476.
 Boaz, 170, 171.
brr, 383.
 נהר, 372.
 נלילה, 456.
 נגבת, 246.
gēbīrāh, 267, 274.
 Gedaliah Over-the-House, 566.
 דבר, 263.
 דוד, 81.
 דומשק, 463.
 דיב, 388.
 דממה, 317.
 הדר, 245, 280, 281.
 הדר, 244, 280.
 הוישע, 456.
 היטן, 132.
 המזבח הנחשת, apposition of thing
 and material, 463.
 הנה, 389.
 הגם, 539.
 וריר, 383.
 זבל, 191, 192, 291.
 זה היה, 272.
 זמרי, 289.
 חור, 124.
 חיה, 371, 372.
 חירם, 138.
 חלדה, 527.

- חלג, 329.
 חלי, 352.
 חלל, מחללים, 86.
 חלקיהו, 527.
 חמוטל, 551.
 חסד, 202.
 חסא, 478.
 חששי, 454.
 חששית, 454.
 חר, 86.
 חרב, 365, 503.
 חרוץ, 522.
 חרחם, 527.
 חרט, 380.
 חרי, 388, 502.
 חרם, 503.
ḥayl, 243.
hillôn, 349.
 חברמן, 281.
 טוב, 513.
 יאזניהו, 569; *cf.* Jaazaniahu, 566.
 יארי מצור, 504.
 יאשיהו, 526.
 יד, 426.
 יהו, 404.
 יהואש, 431.
 יהויכין, 557.
 יהויקים, 552.
 יהונדב, 414.
 יזוכר, 433.
 יזחג, 569.
 יום, conjunction of time, 397.
 יטבה, 522.
 ים סוף, 215.
 יצא, with acc. 512.
 יצא, Hiphil, 455.
 יצוע, 148.
 יקר, 139.
 ירמיהו, 551.
 ירק, 505.
 ישמעאל, 569.
 יתד, 98.
 Jeconiah, 555.
 Yachin, 557.
 Yâkin, 170.
 Yochin, 555.
yôšer, 430.
 כהן, 115.
 כמר, 538.
 כן, 330.
 כרתני, 85, 86.
 כרתת, 180.
kâbôl, 108.
Kerêthim, 78; *cf.* 86.
kêrûb, 155, 156.
kiyôr, 178.
kôhên, 115.
kôhên hâ-rôš, 429, 563.
korban, 428.
 לול, 148.
 להש, 82, 329, 478; *lhš*, 501.
 לקח, Pual ppl., 356.
 מודבר, 318.
 מה, negative, 258, 512.
 מועד, 371.
 מושו, 230.
 מוח, Pual, Polal, 424.
 מובה, 522; *mzbh*, 474.
 מייבך השבת, 464.
 מבנה, 179.
 מכר, 432.
 במלכה, 309.
 מנשה, 521.
 מסנר, 558.
 מסגרת, 179.
 מסח, 424.
 טעלה, 404.
 טוצא, 265.
 טוקה, 231.
 מושא, 406; *cf.* burden, 402.
 מישחה, 540.
 מישחית, 540.
 מישחין, 271.
massâh, 419.
maššebâh, 268, 358; *maššebet*, 535.
minhâh, 362.
mišneh, 526.
 Molek, 232, 233.
 נבות, 333.
 נבהו, 479.
 נור, 425.
 נחש, 82, 478.
 ניר, 247.
 נחשתן, 501; *cf.* Nehushtan, 481, 500.
 נמשי, 404.
 נכח, 424.
 נטרך, 506.
 נשא, נשא, 202.

- נשא, 213.
 נשי, 371.
 נשף, 389.
 נשק, 231.
 נתניה, 569.
nbh̄z (Nibhaz), 474.
noḥēd, 359.
 כוא, 477.
 כנורים, 383.
 סף, 184.
 סבות כנות, 479.
 סרים, 501.
sibbāh, 250.
 עבר (of Baal), 415.
 עבר, 569.
 ער, 138.
 עדות, 425.
 עור, 478.
 עריה, 527.
 עזב, 347.
 עזוב, 271.
 עזר, 477.
 עליה המלהמה, 346; *cf.* 477.
 עלית, 371.
 עמוד, 425.
 עמודים, 165.
 עצור, 271.
 עשה, 330; 'celebrate,' 476.
 עשתרת, 245.
 עת, 371.
 עתרתה (Atargatis), 474, 475.
 'am hā-'āreš, 422, 423.
 'nn, 520.
 'Ashtart, 233, 474, 475.
 פריה, 553.
 פו, 230.
 פחה, 229, 230.
 פלתי, 85.
 פסח, 132, 310.
 פקד, Hothpaal, 328.
 פרבר, פרורים, 539.
 פרש, 82, 83, 327.
Peléthim, 78.
pisḥah, 264, 352, 405, 503.
pāk, 403.
 צבר, 414.
 צוה, 97.
 צטר, 406.
 צטא, apposition of material, 365.
- šēdek*, 197.
šiyān, 535.
šūr, 430.
 קור, קר, 371.
 קום (קמה) קום, 505
ḫēn, 440
 רב טבחים, 568.
 רב שקה, 501.
 רוח, 357.
 רומה, 553.
 רחבעם, 248.
 רכב, 405.
 רפה, רפא, 357.
 רתם, 317.
 ש, 382.
 שבכה, 351.
 שבנה, 501, 502.
 שרמה, שרפה, 505, 538.
 שדרה, 425.
 שחט, 230.
 שטן, 245; *cf.* Satan, 246.
 שיג, 310.
 שיח, 310.
 שין, שתן, 271, 502.
 שבל, 357.
 שלבים, 179.
 ילח, Hiphil, 456.
 שלם, 215, 527.
 שלמה, 84.
 שמרון, 290.
 שנה, 477, 569.
 שעלכין, 124.
 שער, 390.
 שפעה, 405.
 שקפים, 147.
 שר, 118.
 Shaphan, 524, 527.
 Shilōah, 511.
 תור, 229.
 תמס, 527.
 תחטת, 569.
 תעלה, 311.
 תפת, 539; *cf.* Topheth, 532.
 תקוה, 527.
 תרהקה, 503.
 תרתק, 474.
 תשובה, 328.

II. INDEX OF PLACES TREATED WITH ARCHÆOLOGICAL COMMENT

- Abel-beth-Maachah, 278.
 Adam, Adamah, 182.
 Aphek, 324, 328.
 Arubboth, 123.
 Awwa, 472.
- Baalath, 206.
 Baal-shalisha, 370.
 Ben-Hinnom, 532.
 Beth-eked, 409.
 Bethel, 257.
 Beth-haggan, 402.
 Beth-horon, 207.
 Beth-shean, 119.
 Beth-shemesh, 441.
- Carmel, 300.
 Cherith, 294.
 Corner Gate, 441.
- Dan, 278.
 David's City, 90, 102.
 double-walls, 561, 562.
 Dragon Spring, 74.
- Elisha's Spring, 355.
 Eloth, 211, 212.
 En-rogel, 73.
 Entrance of Hamath, 200, 443.
 Ephraim Gate, 441.
 Esyon-geber, 211, 212, 270.
- Gath, 430, 431.
 Gaza, 129.
 Gibeah, 276.
 Gibeon, 104.
 Gilgal, 353.
 Gozan, 467.
 Gur, 402.
- Habor, 467.
 Halah, 467.
 Hamath, 200, 443.
- Hasor, 206, 207.
 Horeb, 313.
 Horses' Gate, 422.
- Iwwah, 472.
 Iyon, 277.
- Janoah, 451, 452.
 Jehoshaphat, Valley of, 530.
 Jericho, 287, 355.
 Jezreel, 330.
 Jibleam, 402.
 Job's Well, 73, 74.
- Kadytis, 537.
 Kebul (Cabul), 205, 213.
 Kedesh, 452.
 Kidron, 530, 531.
 king's garden, 562.
 Kinneroth, 278.
 Kir-hareseth, 363.
 Kir-heres, 363.
 Kue, 227, 459.
 Kuthah, 472.
- Lachish, 442.
 Libnah, 396; *cf.* 398.
- Maon, 239.
 Megiddo, 207, 226, 270, 511, 537.
 Midian, 246.
 Migdol, 537.
 Millo, 206, 243; *cf.* המלוא, 247.
 Mispah, 276.
 Musri, 227, 228.
- Netophah, 569.
- Ophir, 212.
- Paran, 239.
 Penuel, 254.
 Petra, 439, 440.

Ramah, 276.
Ramoḥ-Gilead, 120, 337.
Reseph, 492.
Riblah, 550.
Rock, 439.

Sair, 396; *cf.* 398.
Samaria, 285, 341.
Sarephath, 294; *cf.* 297.
Sarethan, 120, 182.
Sepharwaim, 472.
Şerēdāh, 242.
Shechem, 249, 250.
Siloam, 511, 562.
Sinai, 313.
Socho, 123.
Steppe, 95.
Succoth, 182.

Tadmor, Tamar, 208.
Tarshish, 223.
Tell el-Ḳedaḥ, 207.
Tiphseh, 449, 450.
Tiphseh-Thapsacus, 129.
Tirsah, 281.
Tishbe, 293.
Tuleilat el-Ghassūl, 182.

Upper Pool, 486, 487.

Vale of Ben-Hinnom, 532.
Valley of Salt, 439.

Yānōaḥ, 452.
Ya'ūdi, 447.
Yotebah, 521.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
MORRISON AND GIBB LTD.
EDINBURGH AND LONDON

Montgomery, J. A.
Books of Kings.

BS
491
.I6
v.10

